

would not accomplish what is hoped for and would result in legal chaos through its effect upon a large number of State laws and believing that the removal of legal discriminations against women where they still exist can be accomplished better through legislative action in specific subjects by the State or National legislative bodies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3831. By Mr. MAGNUSON: Petition of residents of Seattle, Wash., favoring House bill 4; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3832. By Mr. SADOWSKI: Petition of the Supporting Government Home Borrowers Association, adopted by Renters and Consumers League of Greater Detroit, Mich.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

3833. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the United Lumber and Timber Workers, Local No. 316, Flat Creek, Ala., supporting the repeal of the Woodrum amendment now pending before Congress relating to Works Progress Administration funds; to the Committee on Appropriations.

## SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 19, 1938

(Legislative day of Wednesday, January 5, 1938)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, January 18, 1938, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Calloway, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 8524. An act authorizing the completion of the existing project for the protection of the sea wall at Galveston Harbor, Tex.; and

H. R. 8947. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, and for other purposes.

### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 2550. An act to permit the printing of black-and-white illustrations of United States and foreign postage stamps for philatelic purposes; and

S. 2940. An act to make confidential certain information furnished to the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, and for other purposes.

### CONDITIONS AFFECTING NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, INTERIOR DEPARTMENT

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, there has been an examination going on before the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys with regard to the qualifications of Mr. Ebert K. Burlew, the nominee for First Assistant Secretary of the Interior. In the very nature of things, it is difficult to have a full attendance of the committee at the present time. There are certain matters that I am now placing in the RECORD for the benefit of members of the committee who have not been able to keep up with the hearings by reason of other official duties which they may consider more important. In that investigation there has been an astounding revelation with regard to the laxity and inefficiency, if not criminal carelessness, in the Finance and Auditing Division of the National Park Service of the Department of the Interior.

A few days ago there was a brief statement in the press that one Reno E. Stitely, a pay clerk in the National Park

Service here in Washington, had pleaded guilty to the embezzlement, through forgery and false vouchers, of approximately \$84,000 of relief funds allotted to the Park Service. A few days prior to that time the name of Mr. Burlew had been sent to the Senate as the nominee for the position of First Assistant Secretary of the Interior. That nomination has been referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys of the Senate.

It was so extraordinary that a pay clerk, over a period of 4 years, through false vouchers, the collecting of Government checks, and forging the names of payees who did not exist, could embezzle the large sum of over \$84,000 that it seemed to reflect upon a bureau of the Interior Department.

As a matter of fact, the Secretary of the Department is primarily responsible for the efficiency in each of the bureaus of his Department, and also for the honesty and integrity of the personnel. Therefore, it might not seem to concern the nominee under consideration, Mr. Burlew. However, the testimony before the committee by Secretary Ickes and Mr. Burlew himself discloses the fact that the Secretary did rely on Mr. Burlew, and had a right to rely on him, to keep him advised with regard to the various bureaus of the Department.

That conclusion may not be concurred in by other members of the committee. However, the testimony of Mr. Ickes discloses the fact that not only does he advise with Mr. Burlew, who is his administrative assistant, but permits him to sign most of his letters or all of them, if he so desires, and has had passed by the House a bill, which is pending before the Senate committee, authorizing Mr. Burlew to sign every kind and character of document which the Secretary may be authorized to sign. When I questioned the Secretary with regard to this extraordinary power, he stated that he had absolute confidence in Mr. Burlew.

Mr. Burlew is not only the administrative assistant who carries out the orders of the Secretary and with whom the Secretary advises, but he is the budget officer. He is the personnel officer over whose desk pass all appointments in the Department of the Interior or in the Public Works Administration.

Mr. President, I am not going to debate this question at the present time because the hearings are not completed, but I have in my hand a report made at the order of Secretary Ickes by the investigating officers of his own Department, and submitted to him. Apparently it was made to him somewhere along in July 1937. It has been submitted in evidence under sworn testimony. I merely desire to read a few statements from the report and then I ask that the entire report be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks as a part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the report will be printed in the RECORD.

(The report appears in the RECORD at the conclusion of Mr. PITTMAN's remarks, p. 747.)

Mr. PITTMAN. This report was made by Mr. R. C. McCarthy and Mr. Cecil G. Miles, special agents for the Department of the Interior. I quote from the report:

This investigation is based on the alleged activities of Reno E. Stitely, chief of the voucher unit, National Park Service, Department of the Interior, in connection with the preparation, falsification, and submission of pay-roll vouchers and the conversion to his own use of United States Government checks issued thereon amounting to \$84,880.03.

This investigation discloses that:

1. Certifying officers approved vouchers signed by persons whose signatures were not known to said certifying officers.

2. Certifying officers were not furnished pay-roll data, such as memorandums of employment or time slips. This information was retained in the office of the approving officer after he had signed voucher.

3. Voucher was presumed to be authentic when it was initialed by Reno E. Stitely.

4. Clerks engaged in the preparation of pay-roll vouchers were authorized to secure checks from the Treasury Department for delivery to persons named therein.

5. No effective reconciliation of E. C. W. funds paid by the War Department for the Department of the Interior could be made from 1933 to July 1936. War Department officials state that their

accounting system could have been arranged to provide almost any information had the Department of the Interior requested it. 6. No reconciliation of accounts payable for the Washington office (National Park Service) has been made since 1933.

7. Approving officers failed to examine monthly statements of costs and expenditures, examination of which would have detected unauthorized vouchers which had been posted.

Special agent:

Special agent:

Approved:

Confidential—not for public inspection.  
U. S. Government Printing Office 16-4946.

I will read just a few more lines from the report on page 2:

Investigation further disclosed that for the past few years Stitley purchased a new automobile each year and sometimes more frequently. The last automobile which he purchased was a Packard 120 convertible sedan. Stitley spent money very lavishly. As the records at the Ambassador Hotel, Washington, D. C., show, on occasion he spent more than \$100 for a wedding anniversary party and \$275 for a 4-day drinking party in February 1936, when he had reported to the National Park Service that he was ill.

Stitley, upon learning that photostats of the missing vouchers had been requested by the National Park Service, began at once to liquidate his bank and brokerage accounts and remained away from the office, claiming illness. He was arrested on April 27, 1937, and is under bond of \$10,000 awaiting action by the Federal grand jury.

Interrogation of the officials and clerks employed in the National Park Service evinced the same information to the effect that, despite Stitley's lavish spending, no suspicion of him was ever considered; that they believed he had made large profits from speculations in the stock market, or that he had inherited a large amount of money.

Investigation further disclosed that Stitley had falsified a total of 134 pay-roll vouchers, comprising 1,116 checks, totaling \$84,880.03, shown as follows:

I will not read the figures.

It will be noted that the greatest number of falsifications related to the Emergency Conservation Works funds and covered a period of nearly 4 years.

Mr. LEWIS. May I interrupt the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. PITTMAN. If the Senator will wait until I finish the reading, which will take me only a little while longer, then I will yield.

Mr. LEWIS. When the Senator has concluded, I desire to make an interrogation, if he will permit me.

Mr. PITTMAN. I continue quoting from the report:

#### COMMENTS

The principal reason these defalcations were permitted to continue for such a long period of time (nearly 5 years) can be attributed to the following:

1. Failure to reconcile accounts payable.

2. Failure of approving officers to examine the monthly statements of costs and expenditures for any improper charges made against their funds.

There were at least two methods which would have disclosed any irregularities, namely:

(a) A reconciliation with the general ledger, which could have been effected by adding to the unencumbered balance the unliquidated encumbrances and unpaid vouchers (accounts payable).

(b) Ascertain that all vouchers were posted to the allotment ledgers.

If the above methods had been followed, there remained but one possibility to pass an illegal voucher, namely, negligence on the part of the approving officer to examine the monthly statement of costs and expenditures.

#### CONCLUSION

The submission of numerous fictitious vouchers by Stitley would have been fruitless unless he secured possession of the checks.

It is inconceivable that the National Park Service would authorize any person connected with the voucher unit engaged in the preparation of pay-roll vouchers to receive checks from the disbursing officers for delivery to the persons named on said pay-roll vouchers.

The records in the Washington office of the National Park Service have not been audited in several years. Neither has a proper audit of E. C. W. funds been made, either in the Washington office of the National Park Service or its numerous field stations. It would require at this time at least six auditors the better part of a year's time to make a proper check of E. C. W. funds paid for the Department of the Interior.

Unless this check is made, it will be impossible to ascertain the number of persons who have taken advantage of the opportunity to unjustly enrich themselves.

#### SUGGESTIONS

It is suggested that—

1. The system of authorizing persons engaged in the preparation of vouchers to receive checks from the Treasury Department for delivery to persons named on said vouchers be abolished.

2. Request be made to the chief disbursing officer, Mr. G. F. Allen, to submit separate accounts current covering the following:

(a) Transactions of the National Park Service Washington office accounts.

(b) Transactions of the National Park Service field office accounts.

3. The accounts section, National Park Service, be required to prepare and submit monthly a statement of control covering all transactions relative to the accounts maintained in the Washington office.

I have already asked permission to have printed in the RECORD the entire report, and permission has been granted. The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator has permission.

The report in full is as follows:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, DIVISION OF INVESTIGATIONS, WASHINGTON

(Region—Division—District)

Date of report: August 5, 1937.

Serial number; previous correspondence; nature of report (favorable or adverse); name of special agent (Interior, Oil Enforcement, or P. W. A.): I. D. 1310-A. D. I. 0547-A.

Origin: Oral instructions from the Director, Division of Investigations, April 12, 1937.

Period of investigation: April 12, 1937, to July 27, 1937.

Robert C. McCarthy and Cecil G. Miles, special agents, Department of the Interior.

Brief: Analysis of the accounting procedure used in the Accounts Section, National Park Service, to determine and to ascertain whether there was negligence in the administration thereof.

This investigation is based on the alleged activities of Reno E. Stitley, chief of the voucher unit, National Park Service, Department of the Interior, in connection with the preparation, falsification and submission of pay-roll vouchers and the conversion to his own use of United States Government checks issued thereon amounting to \$84,880.03.

This investigation discloses that:

1. Certifying officers approved vouchers signed by persons whose signatures were not known to said certifying officers.

2. Certifying officers were not furnished pay-roll data, such as memorandums of employment or time slips. This information was retained in the office of the approving officer after he had signed voucher.

3. Voucher was presumed to be authentic when it was initialed by Reno E. Stitley.

4. Clerks engaged in the preparation of pay-roll vouchers were authorized to secure checks from the Treasury Department for delivery to persons named therein.

5. No effective reconciliation of E. C. W. funds paid by the War Department for the Department of the Interior could be made from 1933 to July 1936. War Department officials state that their accounting system could have been arranged to provide almost any information had the Department of the Interior requested it.

6. No reconciliation of accounts payable for the Washington office (National Park Service) has been made since 1933.

7. Approving officers failed to examine monthly statements of costs and expenditures, examination of which would have detected unauthorized vouchers which had been posted.

CECIL G. MILES,  
Special Agent.

RCM: LK.

R. C. MCCARTHY,  
Special Agent.

Approved:

CHARLES HURLEY.

Confidential—not for public inspection.

Date, ———. Referred to ——— for appropriate action. Please advise Division of Investigations of action taken.

DIRECTOR OF INVESTIGATIONS.

United States Government Printing Office, 16-4946.

#### LIST OF EXHIBITS

Exhibit A: Memorandum of Perry D. Edwards, Acting Chief of the Accounts Section, National Park Service, dated May 13, 1937.

Exhibit B: Memorandum of F. W. Watson, Chief of the Audit Division, Accounts Section, National Park Service, dated May 20, 1937.

Exhibit B-1: Memorandum of F. W. Watson, Chief of the Audit Division, Accounts Section, National Park Service, dated May 28, 1937.

#### BASIS FOR INVESTIGATION

This investigation was predicated on information furnished the Director of the Division of Investigations on April 12, 1937, relative to certain pay-roll vouchers which did not appear to be authentic.



The original and supplemental criminal reports covering the investigation have been submitted (I. D. 1310).

This investigation is made for the purpose of analyzing the accounting procedure used in the accounts section of the National Park Service and to determine the sufficiency of the accounting system employed relative to the prevention of irregularities and frauds against the Government.

#### HISTORY OF THE CASE

On or about April 1, 1937, a representative from the chief disbursing office of the Treasury Department informed the accounts section that the balance remaining in the appropriation "14-41-44-0699 (4-OW 671.1 old number) working fund, Interior, National Park Service (emergency relief, surplus relief, National Industrial Recovery)" was nearly exhausted, there being less than \$300 unexpended; whereas the allotment ledger for this appropriation showed an unexpended balance of about \$7,000.

In reconciling the differences, it was found that five pay-roll vouchers totaling \$6,855.60 had been passed for payment during the period April to August 1936, and had not been posted to the allotment ledgers. Copies of these vouchers could not be located. Accordingly, a request was sent by the National Park Service to the General Accounting Office for photostats.

Information had reached the Director of the Division of Investigations in connection with this matter, and a request was forwarded to the General Accounting Office for photostats of the missing vouchers and checks applicable thereto.

Under date of April 19, 1937, the photostats were received, which disclosed that 54 checks bore the second endorsement of Reno E. Stitely, Chief of the Voucher Unit, Accounting Section, National Park Service, and had been cashed at the Washington Loan & Trust Co., West End Branch, Washington, D. C.

Investigation of the accounts at the Washington Loan & Trust Co. disclosed that Reno E. Stitely had made numerous large deposits to several savings and checking accounts which he had opened at that bank; that in one or two accounts, as many as six Government checks had been deposited at regular intervals of 2 weeks over a period of several months.

Investigation further disclosed that Reno E. Stitely had deposited in various accounts, over which he exercised control, and in various banks and building associations from 1932 to May 1937, \$75,364.37, less \$4,370, representing deposits to his accounts indicating bank loans, or a net total of \$70,994.37. From 1933 to 1937, Stitely purchased stocks through the Washington Loan & Trust Co. and stocks and commodities through the E. A. Pierce Co. amounting to \$258,342.51. Stitely also purchased a new dwelling in May 1935, at a cost of \$12,000, paying down the sum of \$500, and executed notes totaling \$5,000, due as follows: \$1,000 payable June 1, 1935; \$1,000 payable July 1, 1935; \$2,000 payable January 1, 1936; \$1,000 payable July 31, 1936.

The remaining \$6,500 was represented by a first trust. The \$5,500 payments by Stitely were made over a period of 13 months, which was nearly two and one-half times his salary of \$2,300 as chief of the voucher unit, Accounts Section, National Park Service.

Investigation further disclosed that for the past few years Stitely purchased a new automobile each year, and sometimes more frequently. The last automobile which he purchased was a Packard 120 convertible sedan. Stitely spent money very lavishly; as the records at the Ambassador Hotel, Washington, D. C., show, on occasion he spent more than \$100 for a wedding anniversary party and \$275 for a 4-day drinking party in February 1936 when he had reported to the National Park Service that he was ill.

Stitely, upon learning that photostats of the missing vouchers had been requested by the National Park Service, began at once to liquidate his bank and brokerage accounts and remained away from the office, claiming illness. He was arrested on April 27, 1937, and is under bond of \$10,000 awaiting action by the Federal grand jury.

Interrogation of the officials and clerks employed in the National Park Service evinced the same information to the effect that, despite Stitely's lavish spending, no suspicion of him was ever considered; that they believed he had made large profits from speculations in the stock market, or that he had inherited a large amount of money.

Investigation further disclosed that Stitely had falsified a total of 134 pay-roll vouchers, comprising 1,116 checks, totalling \$84,880.03, shown as follows:

Appropriation symbol	Period	Number of pay-roll vouchers	Number of checks	Amount
42/3400 National Park Service, 1932-33 (4-420 Great Smoky Mountains National Park).	Sept. 19, 1932-Feb. 28, 1933.	6	19	\$1,013.01
42/3400 National Park Service, 1932-33 (4-440 Colonial Monument and 4-439, George Washington's Birthplace National Monument).	Oct. 1, 1932-Mar. 31, 1935.	2	3	144.00
4X436 Roads and trails, National Parks, Gatlinburg, Tenn.	Nov. 16, 1932-Jan. 31, 1933.	4	17	1,015.98
4X436 Roads and trails, National Park Service, Washington, D. C.	Feb. 20-June 30, 1933.	12	74	5,182.20
F D 570 P1-0110 A8815N Emergency Conservation funds.	July 1, 1933-Mar. 31, 1937.	91	799	57,512.64

Appropriation symbol	Period	Number of pay-roll vouchers	Number of checks	Amount
4-03/7640.14 N. I. R., Interior, national parks, 1933-37 (F. P. 672).	Mar. 16-Apr. 15, 1936.	3	12	\$1,274.00
14-44-4629 N. I. R., Interior, national parks, roads and trails, act June 16, 1933.	July 1-Aug. 15, 1936.	2	26	2,467.50
14-1130 Roads and trails, national parks, emergency construction.	Oct. 16, 1936-Mar. 15, 1937.	9	112	9,415.10
40W671.1 Working fund, Interior, National Park Service (emergency relief, surplus relief, N. I. R.).	Apr. 17-Aug. 15, 1936.	5	54	6,855.60
Total		134	1,116	84,880.03

#### EMERGENCY CONSERVATION FUNDS

It will be noted that the greatest number of falsifications related to the Emergency Conservation Works funds and covered a period of nearly 4 years.

The finance officer for the War Department (Washington district) required a letter from officials in charge of preparing and submitting pay-roll vouchers authorizing any individuals to receive checks for delivery in person to those named on any pay roll or voucher which bore the signature of said official as certifying officer. The authorization was to remain in effect until canceled by said certifying officer.

Stitely submitted a letter bearing the traced signature of J. R. Lassiter, superintendent of Shenandoah National Park, to the finance officer, United States Army, Washington, D. C., who was one of the finance officers disbursing E. C. W. funds for the National Park Service. After submitting two pay rolls in July 1933 purporting to be for appointed personnel, Stitely submitted a different set of names beginning with August 15, 1933, also purporting to be for appointed personnel. He continued with these same names every 2 weeks (with the exception of one period, September 1 to September 15, 1933) until March 31, 1937.

Agents interviewed Lt. Col. E. C. Morton, finance officer, United States Army, for the Washington field office, and Mr. Spencer Burroughs, chief clerk under Lieutenant Colonel Morton. Lieutenant Colonel Morton stated that since the authorization submitted by Stitely appeared to be authentic he felt obliged to pay these vouchers and to deliver the checks to him so long as they appeared to be certified by the proper certifying officer, J. R. Lassiter.

Mr. Burroughs informed agents that, although the six camps at Shenandoah National Park sent their pay rolls through the usual channels for payment, he was not suspicious of Stitely when the latter told him that a representative from Shenandoah National Park was coming to Washington every pay day on official business and would take the checks back with him.

Mr. Burroughs further stated that Stitely brought along the original and two copies of said pay-roll vouchers; that upon delivery of said checks the original was sent to the General Accounting Office, one copy retained for the War Department files, and one copy given back to Stitely for the National Park Service files. Superintendent Lassiter stated that since the fall of 1934 the War Department required him to submit the addresses of all persons on the E. C. W. pay rolls; that since that time all checks were mailed directly to these employees.

The fact that none of these vouchers were ever posted to the E. C. W. allotment ledgers, either at the Washington office, National Park Service, or at Shenandoah National Park, indicates that Stitely never turned these vouchers over to the bookkeeping unit.

Stitely appeared to have no difficulty in cashing the checks or depositing same to any one of the numerous banking accounts which he had at the Washington Loan & Trust Co.

At this point it may be appropriate to present a picture of the accounting procedure agreed upon in 1933 between the Army Finance Office and the other departments of the Government handling E. C. W. work. Mr. E. E. Tillett, who was then chief accountant for the National Park Service (now field supervisor, E. C. W., for Territory of Hawaii), represented the Department of the Interior. An agreement was reached whereby the Army Finance Office would allocate the E. C. W. vouchers submitted by the Department of the Interior into the following groups, namely, State Parks, National Parks, General Land Office, Reclamation Service.

Later a further allocation was made of E. C. W. vouchers pertaining to the Virgin Islands, the Territory of Hawaii, and Hawaii National Park. The symbol F D 570 was designated for National Parks and F D 580 for State parks. The Accounts Section, National Park Service, found this allocation practically valueless for the reason that the War Department did not show the field station issuing the vouchers.

After 3 years had elapsed, the National Park Service requested the Chief of Finance, War Department, to furnish information showing payments for each field station. Accordingly, beginning with July 1936, the Chief of Finance submitted monthly statements showing payments made by subprocurement authorities.

Example: Acadia National Park was assigned No. 5501P; Crater Lake National Park, 5502P, etc., to 5599; State parks began with

5601-5699; Territory of Hawaii from 5700-5799; Hawaii National Park from 5800-5899; Virgin Islands from 5900-5999; Isle Royale from 6000-6099; Reclamation Service from 6100-6199.

This tabulation showed a procurement code symbol (purpose number) voucher number, date paid, amount paid, and other pertinent information.

Mr. George R. Taylor, Assistant Chief, Office of the Chief of Finance, United States Army, informed agents that his office could have arranged their system in 1933 to provide for this allocation had the National Park Service made such request. Since July 1936 up to the date of this investigation the tabulations furnished by the Office of the Chief of Finance, United States Army, had not been audited by the National Park Service, Washington office, nor by the Field Audit Division, National Park Service. The latter division has several auditors assigned to checking the field stations. However, the vouchers paid by the finance officers of the United States Army were never verified with the National Park Service field station allotment ledgers.

Stitely wasted no time in taking advantage of the situation, for he began drawing on the E. C. W. funds in July 1933 just as soon as they were available. He could feel reasonably certain to escape detection just so long as the above-mentioned reconciliation was not effected.

#### VOUCHERS OTHER THAN E. C. W.

The same principle applied to vouchers other than E. C. W., except that Stitely had to secure an authentic certification of a duly authorized certifying officer before he could pass these spurious vouchers for payment. The certifying officer did not obtain signature cards from the approving officers, as he relied on Stitely to determine the correctness and authenticity of the vouchers; consequently, no difficulty was encountered in securing the certification of any voucher, provided it bore the initials of Reno E. Stitely.

Prior to 1934, when the National Park Service was disbursing its own funds, the disbursing officer, R. L. Lassly, acting chief disbursing clerk, relied on the approval of R. M. Holmes, Chief Clerk, National Park Service, before paying a voucher. Mr. Holmes, in a great many instances, did not know the signature of the person signing the voucher but relied on its authenticity and correctness because it was initialed by Reno E. Stitely.

In the files which Mr. Oliver G. Taylor submitted to agents there was found a copy of a pay roll for the period June 1 to June 30, 1933, appropriation 4X436, roads and trails, national parks, bearing the name of Patrick W. Ickes, employed as a senior laborer. The amount paid Ickes was \$17. The pay roll which was passed through for payment had the same name and amount on the first line. However, seven names were added thereto. The paid voucher amounted to \$724, less economy deductions of \$108.60, or a net total of \$615.40. The latter amount was posted to the allotment ledgers and a monthly statement furnished Mr. Taylor. Had this monthly statement of costs and expenditures been checked by Mr. Taylor the error would have been located. The same sort of error could have been found as early as November 1932, when a copy of pay roll voucher on file in Mr. Taylor's office for the period October 1 to October 15, 1932, showed the amount of \$47.67, whereas the voucher paid amounted to \$99.

With respect to the June 1933 voucher, referred to above, Mr. Taylor stated in a memorandum, which is incorporated in the supplemental criminal report (exhibit 3) that the signature thereon appears to be his genuine signature; that he never signed any pay roll carrying any of the names appearing on it except that of Patrick W. Ickes.

Since Mr. Taylor does not claim that his name was forged to this voucher, and since the amount of the paid voucher does not agree with the "copy" in his files, it appears reasonable to presume that Mr. Taylor signed the original voucher before the amounts were inserted thereon.

#### ACCOUNTING PROCEDURE—WASHINGTON OFFICE

Submitted herewith is a memorandum (exhibit A, not printed in record) from Mr. Perry D. Edwards, Acting Chief of the Accounting Section, National Park Service, dated May 13, 1937, which describes the accounting system in use in the Accounts Section of the National Park Service, Washington office. On page 2, paragraph 2 of this memorandum the statement is made that the accounts payable have not been reconciled since June 1933, and the field allotment ledgers have not been audited for 4 or 5 months. Furthermore, the control accounts have not been posted since December 1936, nor has a statement of balances been prepared since December 1936.

The procedure for "checking out" is set forth in detail by Mr. F. W. Watson, Chief, Audit Division, Accounts Section, National Park Service, in memorandums dated May 20 and May 28, 1937, exhibits B and B-1, respectively (not printed in record).

Both Mr. Watson and Mr. Edwards believe that after the paid schedules of disbursements were returned by the chief disbursing officer and were checked against the daily summaries of disbursements Stitely withdrew the vouchers and the paid schedules before they could be checked against the allotment ledgers to ascertain if properly posted. Both of these officials admit that the work has been far in arrears for the past several years. The checking out does not appear to have been done systematically. If the clerks had caught up with the current work they would have spent a little time on the work in arrears. It is the opinion of agents that the clerks assigned to this work did not make a complete audit, otherwise some of these spurious vouchers would have been detected.

#### COMMENTS

The principal reason these defalcations were permitted to continue for such a long period of time (nearly 5 years) can be attributed to the following:

1. Failure to reconcile accounts payable.
2. Failure of approving officers to examine the monthly statements of costs and expenditures for any improper charges made against their funds.

There were at least two methods which would have disclosed any irregularities, namely:

- (a) A reconciliation with the general ledger, which could have been effected by adding to the unencumbered balance the unliquidated encumbrances and unpaid vouchers (accounts payable).
- (b) Ascertain that all vouchers were posted to the allotment ledgers.

If the above methods had been followed, there remained but one possibility to pass an illegal voucher, namely—negligence on the part of the approving officer to examine the monthly statement of costs and expenditures.

#### HANDWRITING

Dr. Wilmer Souder, handwriting expert for the National Bureau of Standards, has examined 566 Treasury checks bearing Stitely's endorsement and is convinced that 388 of these checks bear the endorsement of the payees in the handwriting of Reno E. Stitely; that 166 other checks have been forged, probably by Stitely, and the remaining 12 cannot be proved definitely to have been forged by Stitely.

Dr. Souder has also examined 97 pay-roll vouchers, of which he states 5 were forged by Stitely. The remaining 92 vouchers bear traced signatures of various approving officers. However, all checks were cashed by Stitely.

#### CONCLUSION

The submission of numerous fictitious vouchers by Stitely would have been fruitless unless he secured possession of the checks.

It is inconceivable that the National Park Service would authorize any person connected with the voucher unit engaged in the preparation of pay-roll vouchers to receive checks from the disbursing officers for delivery to the persons named on said pay-roll vouchers.

The records in the Washington office of the National Park Service have not been audited in several years. Neither has a proper audit of E. C. W. funds been made, either in the Washington office of the National Park Service or its numerous field stations.

It would require at this time at least six auditors the better part of a year's time to make a proper check of E. C. W. funds paid for the Department of the Interior.

Unless this check is made it will be impossible to ascertain the number of persons who have taken advantage of the opportunity to unjustly enrich themselves.

#### SUGGESTIONS

It is suggested that—

1. The system of authorizing persons engaged in the preparation of vouchers to receive checks from the Treasury Department for delivery to persons named on said vouchers be abolished.

2. Request be made to the chief disbursing officer, Mr. G. F. Allen, to submit separate accounts current covering the following:

- (a) Transactions of the National Park Service, Washington office accounts.

- (b) Transactions of the National Park Service field office accounts.

3. The Accounts Section, National Park Service, be required to prepare and submit monthly a statement of control covering all transactions relative to the accounts maintained in the Washington office.

Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. LEWIS, and other Senators addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nevada yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. PITTMAN. I yield first to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I do not know anything about the matter to which the Senator has been referring, but in this connection I wish to ask him about another matter. It seems that this man Stitely has been convicted, has he not?

Mr. PITTMAN. He has pleaded guilty.

Mr. McKELLAR. He has pleaded guilty; and the remarkable thing is that after he has pleaded guilty to the embezzlement or procurement by corrupt methods of a very large sum of public funds—\$85,000, I believe, or in that neighborhood—his punishment is being held up by the court awaiting a report from a probation officer. Is that usual and customary in such cases?

Mr. PITTMAN. The committee was informed that that is the practice in this district.

Mr. McKELLAR. Then it is a practice which ought to be attended to by Congress, and it ought to be prohibited



by law, because when a man pleads guilty to embezzlement, certainly in an amount like that, and forgery of names and accounts, surely there ought not to be any question of probation for him.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President—

Mr. PITTMAN. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LEWIS. I ask the Senator from Nevada whether the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Ickes, has supervision of the subject referred to in this report, and whether the Secretary has been informed and has been before the committee with regard to the matter in question. If so, I ask what he has to say upon this subject; or has he been queried as to why this embezzlement occurred and the responsibility for it?

Mr. PITTMAN. The Senator asks several somewhat involved questions at once.

Mr. LEWIS. Yes; because of my interest in the Secretary of the Interior, who is from my State, and my anxiety that his record be held clean, if it is clean.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. Ickes has jurisdiction over the Park Service. The Secretary of the Interior was the first witness before the committee. He was asked no questions concerning this matter, I believe. He was interrogated first with regard to the qualifications of Mr. Burlew and why he desired his confirmation as Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. Burlew, however, was interrogated with regard to this matter. Apparently he knew very little about it, and he seemed to think it was rather the fault of the War Department. The representatives of the War Department have been before the committee, and have testified that the only function placed upon them was to disburse the money on approved vouchers of various bureaus of the Department. That is where the matter now stands.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President—

Mr. PITTMAN. I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. I ask the Senator from Nevada whether the Comptroller General has any responsibility with respect to pay-roll vouchers of this kind?

Mr. PITTMAN. So far as the testimony before the committee at the present time shows, he has not.

Mr. GEORGE. They do not pass through his office after the disbursement has been made to the National Park Service?

Mr. PITTMAN. No.

Mr. GEORGE. The transaction is purely interdepartmental then?

Mr. PITTMAN. Yes.

#### CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, I observe the absence of a quorum, and ask that the roll be called.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Clark	Johnson, Calif.	Pepper
Andrews	Connally	Johnson, Colo.	Pittman
Ashurst	Copeland	King	Pope
Austin	Davis	La Follette	Radcliffe
Bailey	Donahay	Lewis	Reynolds
Bankhead	Duffy	Lodge	Russell
Barkley	Ellender	Logan	Schwartz
Berry	Frazier	Louderman	Schwellenbach
Bilbo	George	Lundeen	Sheppard
Bone	Gibson	McAdoo	Shipstead
Borah	Gillette	McCarran	Smathers
Bridges	Glass	McGill	Smith
Brown, Mich.	Guffey	McKellar	Steiwer
Brown, N. H.	Hale	McNary	Thomas, Okla.
Bulkeley	Harrison	Maloney	Thomas, Utah
Bulow	Hatch	Minton	Townsend
Burke	Hayden	Neely	Truman
Byrnes	Herring	Norris	Tydings
Capper	Hill	Nye	Vandenberg
Caraway	Hitchcock	O'Mahoney	Van Nuys
Chavez	Holt	Overton	Walsh

Mr. LEWIS. I announce that the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HUGHES] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are absent because of colds.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIETERICH], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent, attending the inauguration of the Governor of Virginia.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MILLER] is absent, attending a meeting of the project committee of the Rivers and Harbors Congress.

I ask that this announcement be entered for the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-four Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

#### INDIAN CREDIT OPERATIONS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, reporting relative to the status as of June 30, 1937, and December 31, 1937, of credit operations under authority of the Indian Reorganization Act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 984), and the Oklahoma General Welfare Act of June 26, 1936 (49 Stat. 1967), which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

#### CANCELATION OF REIMBURSABLE CHARGES AGAINST INDIANS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting for the approval of Congress, in accordance with the requirement of law, cancellations and adjustments of reimbursable charges of the Government existing as debts against certain individual Indians or tribes of Indians, as recommended by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

#### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation, Local No. 29, of the United Federal Workers of America, favoring the prompt enactment of House bill 8428, to provide for the hearing and disposition of employee appeals from discriminatory treatment by superiors in the Federal service, which was referred to the Committee on Civil Service.

He also laid before the Senate resolutions adopted by Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation, Local No. 29 and Local No. 57, of Detroit, Mich., both of the United Federal Workers of America, favoring the enactment of House bill 8431, establishing a 5-day workweek in the Federal service, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Civil Service.

He also laid before the Senate a letter in the nature of a petition from the United Wholesale and Warehouse Employees of New York, N. Y., praying for the prompt enactment of the bill (H. R. 1507) to assure to persons within the jurisdiction of every State the equal protection of the laws and to punish the crime of lynching, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also laid before the Senate a telegram in the nature of a memorial from the Amalgamated Association of Street Electric Railway and Motor Coach Employees of America, Detroit, Mich., protesting against any curtailment in the appropriation for the National Labor Relations Board, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. WALSH presented a resolution adopted by Conseil No. 258, L'Union Saint-Jean-Baptiste d'Amérique, Adams, Mass., protesting against pending or proposed foreign trade agreements as they may affect the shoe and textile industries of New England, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. COPELAND presented petitions of sundry citizens of New York City and vicinity, praying for the enactment of legislation to increase the compensation of laborers in the custodial service, which were referred to the Committee on Civil Service.

He also presented the petition of members of the Woman's Home Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Mechanicville, N. Y., praying for the enactment of the so-called Neely-Pettengill bill pertaining to the block book-

ing of motion-picture films, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of New York City and vicinity, praying for the adoption of the so-called Ludlow amendment to the Constitution providing referenda on war, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a resolution adopted by Miller Grange, No. 442, Patrons of Husbandry, of Truxton, N. Y., protesting against the enactment of the bill (S. 2970) to provide for reorganizing agencies of the Government, extending the classified civil service, establishing a general auditing office and a department of welfare, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. GEORGE presented the following resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Georgia, which was ordered to lie on the table:

Whereas there is now pending before the Congress of the United States what is known as the antilynching bill, same being little calculated to confer benefit upon any part of this country and same being an unwarranted and unnecessary affront to the Southern States and being a brazen attempt to politically capitalize upon bigoted prejudice: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Georgia, That it commends the action of the southern Senators in the United States Congress for their brave and tenacious fight against this unjust measure and hopes for them success in the continuance of their fight.*

#### ADDITIONAL COPIES OF PART 3, SENATE REPORT NO. 46—VIOLATIONS OF FREE SPEECH AND RIGHTS OF LABOR

Mr. HAYDEN. From the Committee on Printing, I report back favorably, without amendment, a resolution for which I ask immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 223) submitted by Mr. LA FOLLETTE on the 18th instant was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved, That there be printed 5,000 additional copies of Senate Report No. 46, part 3, current Congress, on violations of free speech and rights of labor, of which 1,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate document room and 4,000 copies for the use of the Senate Subcommittee on Education and Labor conducting the investigation.*

#### BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McNARY:

A bill (S. 3274) for the relief of Jack Mattson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

A bill (S. 3275) for the relief of the personal representative of James L. McDonnell; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WALSH:

A bill (S. 3276) to amend the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 3277) to authorize alterations and repairs to certain naval vessels, and for other purposes; and

A bill (S. 3278) to provide for the reimbursement of Donald W. Supernois, fireman first class, United States Navy, for the value of personal effects lost while engaged in emergency relief expeditions during the Ohio Valley flood, in February 1937; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (S. 3279) to designate United States Highway No. 6 as the "Grand Army of the Republic Highway"; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A bill (S. 3280) placing provisional officers of the World War in the same status with emergency officers of the World War and extending to them the same benefits and privileges as are now or may hereafter be provided by law, orders, and regulations for said emergency officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 3281) to amend Public Law No. 467, Seventy-third Congress (Federal Credit Union Act), approved June 26, 1934; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BILBO:

A bill (S. 3282) to amend the law with respect to robbery in the District of Columbia to provide that such crime may be punished as a capital offense; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

#### HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred as indicated below:

H. R. 8524. An act authorizing the completion of the existing project for the protection of the sea wall at Galveston, Tex.; to the Committee on Commerce.

H. R. 8947. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

#### PREVENTION OF AND PUNISHMENT FOR LYNCHING

Mr. McKELLAR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the amendment of Mr. LEWIS, as modified, to the bill (H. R. 1507) to assure to persons within the jurisdiction of every State the equal protection of the laws and to punish the crime of lynching, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

#### AMENDMENT TO INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. McNARY submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$25,000 for the restoration and preservation of the home of Dr. John McLoughlin, chief factor of the Hudson's Bay Co. and father of the Oregon country, at Oregon City, Oreg., as a historic American building in accordance with law, intended to be proposed by him to the Interior Department Appropriation bill, 1939, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

#### PRODUCTIVE EXPANSION OF INDUSTRY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR DAVIS

[Mr. McNARY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator DAVIS at the twenty-fifth annual convention of the Pennsylvania Thresherman's Protective Association at Harrisburg, Pa., on January 18, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### PREVENTION OF AND PUNISHMENT FOR LYNCHING

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1507) to assure to persons within the jurisdiction of every State the equal protection of the laws and to punish the crime of lynching.

The VICE PRESIDENT. When the Senate took a recess yesterday, the RECORD shows that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] was to be recognized today under a sort of gentlemen's agreement. With the permission of the Senator from Louisiana, the Chair would like to make a statement concerning what the Chair understands to be the parliamentary situation as it applies to the pending piece of legislation.

The rules of the Senate specifically provide, and for more than 100 years have provided, that a Senator may make only two speeches on any one question "on the same day." That brings up the question, What is a day? There is nothing in the printed rules of the Senate defining a "day"; but on a number of occasions the Senate has acquiesced in the ruling of the Presiding Officer that where recesses instead of adjournments are taken, the word "day" means the legislative day, regardless of the number of calendar days that may be embraced in it.

In other words, we are still in one legislative day on this bill. Therefore no Senator may speak more than twice on this legislative day on the particular question pending, which is the amendment of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS] as modified.

What constitutes a speech? The Senate has changed its rulings on that subject a number of times. Up until 3 years ago, when the late Senator from Louisiana, Mr. Long, was addressing the Senate, when a Senator asked unanimous consent to insert matter in the RECORD, as the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] did a moment ago, that was not regarded as a second speech; it continued to be part of the first speech. Technically speaking, however, the Senate



ruled with reference to the late Senator from Louisiana, Mr. Long, that when he yielded for the purpose of a quorum, or for a unanimous-consent agreement for any purpose, even asking unanimous consent himself to address the Senate or to insert matter in the Record, that constituted another speech.

If the Senate desires to adhere to that ruling, that is its affair. If the present occupant of the chair is in the chair when the question arises, he is going to submit the question to the Senate, because the Senate never has officially, by record vote or otherwise, expressed itself upon the subject. The Chair thinks the Senate is the proper body to determine just how it wishes to limit its debate. It seems that the Senate has, in effect, two sets of rules—one for the ordinary transaction of business, the other when the Senate desires to restrain the transaction of business, by a minority or otherwise.

So that Senators may understand the matter in the future, the Chair is going to apply the rules and the precedents of the Senate in a technical manner. That is to say, when the Senator from Louisiana yields, except for a question, he loses the floor. It constitutes one speech. It does not make any difference what he yields for, with the exception of a question, because if a Senator asks unanimous consent for one purpose it is just as important as it is for another purpose.

May the Chair be permitted to illustrate? If the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] were here at the moment and should ask unanimous consent that the pending bill, with the amendment of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS], be considered as engrossed, read a third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table, and the Senate agreed to it, that would be business, would it not?

If a Senator makes a request for unanimous consent to insert matter in the Record as a part of his remarks, or for a roll call, the consent of the Senate must be obtained, and, in the opinion of the Chair, one consent, technically speaking, is just as important as another consent.

The Chair holds that when a Senator is addressing the Senate and yields for the granting of unanimous consent it constitutes business.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. CONNALLY. A parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Just a moment. The Senator from Texas has risen to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, does the rule which provides that a Senator shall not speak more than twice on the same day on any question mean that he may speak twice on any amendment, or any bill, or any motion, or any other question which properly comes before the Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator states the parliamentary situation correctly.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I rise to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Under the ruling of the Chair, what would be the effect of a speech on a subject entirely different from the question pending? For instance, yesterday the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] made a speech on the T. V. A., and if I were to secure the floor for the purpose of making a reply to that speech, would I be in order?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Tennessee would be in order. He can speak on any subject whatever, but he can speak only twice on the particular question pending before the Senate, which is the amendment, as modified, of the Senator from Illinois. No matter what subject the Senator discusses, his remarks will be counted against him as one speech.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Chair.

Mr. WALSH. A parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WALSH. Will the ruling of the Chair prevent Senators from filing petitions and introducing bills at the clerk's desk?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No; it does not apply to such business in any sense of the word. When the Senate meets and a Senator rises and introduces a bill, that does not constitute a speech on the pending question.

Mr. WALSH. If I desire to introduce some bills and ask the consent of the Senator from Louisiana for that privilege, will he lose the floor if he yields?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator understands that petitions, memorials, and private bills can be introduced by being presented at the desk; but if a Senator desires to introduce a public measure, he will have to get unanimous consent of the Senate, which would constitute business.

Mr. WALSH. And that would take the Senator from the floor?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That would take the Senator from the floor. The Chair may remind Senators that the power of recognition is in the Chair. If a Senator asks unanimous consent, the Chair can recognize another Senator if he happens to be standing, but it is the custom of the present occupant of the chair, and of all others who preside in the Senate, to continue to recognize the Senator who has the floor; but the power of recognition resides in the Chair when a Senator who has the floor yields the floor, technically or otherwise.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I rise to make a parliamentary observation. In my opinion, the Vice President has lucidly and definitely stated the rule, and he has my hearty concurrence.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BORAH. Assuming that a Senator has the floor and is addressing the Senate, and is interrupted by a Senator for a question; is such an interruption permitted under the rule?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is. Under the precedents a Senator may yield for a question, but if a Senator permits himself to be interrupted and yields to a Senator for other purposes than a question, then it may be held that he has spoken once, and he may lose the floor. The Senator from Louisiana has the floor.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, when the Senate took a recess yesterday I had concluded reading from early Egyptian history and had shown that as long as the Egyptian nation was under the control and under the influence of white rulers, civilization progressed, but that just as soon as there was a mixture of that pure white race with the colored race, a mongrelized race followed, and, as a consequence, decay.

I want my position understood on this subject, especially by the vast number of Negroes who now live in this country, our wards, as I consider them. The remarks I have heretofore made and the remarks I intend to make are not to be taken by those Negroes to mean that I do not respect their principles. I do. I would be the last man on earth to do anything to hurt the Negro race. I am merely bringing out these points to show that if America is to advance, if our civilization is to progress, I do not want the inventive genius which seems to permeate the people of our Nation to be in any wise hampered. I want our country to continue to go forward, to retain her prestige and supremacy as a world power, not only for the benefit of the white race but for the benefit and good of the colored race as well, because, as I have argued in the past and have been able to show, let me say to the Senator from Washington [Mr. SCHWELLENBACH], whenever the white race in other countries has remained at the head of the government, progress has been maintained, and on the other hand, when the mongrel became the ruler, he suffered, and his civilization decayed.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. I should like to ask the Senator whether progress to which he refers has been any faster progress than that we are making with the speech of the Senator from Louisiana. [Laughter.]

Mr. ELLENDER. In answer to the Senator from Washington, I am egoist enough to believe—and I state this confidently—that I have not yet started what I would term a filibuster on the pending bill, if that is what is in his mind. When we refer to filibustering on a question, I deem it to mean that any kind of a book on any subject foreign to what is before the Senate is discussed just to consume time. I consider that should I pursue that course, that will mean filibustering. The fact is that, although I have apparently been long-winded on this subject, the points I have developed up to the present, in my humble opinion, required the time I have devoted to them in order to make my position clear. The Senator will recall that in the early part of my speech I stated I felt the bill we were considering did not have much to do with the prevention of lynching—that the question involved presented a social problem. There are at this time on the calendar of the House of Representatives bills which would have a tendency to give a little more social equality to the Negro, I may say, than he now has. If such bills are passed, I claim that just as surely as I am standing here there will be trouble. There is pending in the House of Representatives a bill to repeal the so-called southern Jim Crow law through Federal legislation. The Senator knows what that law is. It provides that in the South colored people and white people can ride in the same conveyances, but the operator of a carrier must provide separate compartments for the Negroes and the whites.

If the House of Representatives shall consider the bill to repeal the Jim Crow law, these cliques of colored people I described yesterday, located in Harlem, in Chicago, and in other places in the United States, will become a little more brazen in their demands and will say to the House of Representatives and to the Senate, "Boys, you have succeeded very well in having the antilynching bill passed. Now there is a bill before the House of Representatives to repeal the Jim Crow law, and we expect you boys to get together and 'deliver'; and if you do not, we may not vote for you the next time you come up for election."

I do not infer that any Member of the Senate is making such promises, but that is what is in the minds of their Negro constituents who are advocating such measures. And I believe that the same strategy prompted the action of the legislators in the States of the Union where the statutes to which I referred yesterday and the day before and the day before were adopted.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may ask another question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. When the Senator starts to discuss the Jim Crow law, will he not keep in mind that we passed a 70-car bill last spring, and the Senator will not have to talk quite as long as if that bill had not been passed. [Laughter.]

Mr. ELLENDER. That measure related primarily to freight trains. We have never heard of 70-car passenger trains. [Laughter.] That measure to which the Senator refers relates to freight. I did not expect in the course of this debate to touch upon that subject.

I repeat that I hold no bitterness against the Negro race. On the contrary, I sympathize with them. I do not believe there is a man in the Senate who has greater compassion for them. I yield to none when it comes to the question of a sympathetic understanding for the colored race and its problems. At some future time—not during the present speech—I propose to show the Senate what the South has done for the Negro race, and particularly what Louisiana, my native State, has done for it. We have not drawn the color line there when it comes to providing hospitalization, when it comes to furnishing Federal work, as we are doing now, or furnishing relief for the economic situation in which the colored man finds himself. When we in Louisiana abolished the tax from the home owner we did not exclude the colored man. On the contrary, we were glad to extend that privilege to him.

I have in my pocket a picture as evidence to show the respect and the admiration the South as a whole has for the law-abiding Negro. I received a post card this morning, sent from a town in Natchitoches Parish, La. On that post card appears the picture of a monument to an old-time Negro, who stands on a granite pedestal with hat in hand, respectfully bowing his head, and on that pedestal is inscribed a tribute by the southern people to the colored race:

Erected by the city of Natchitoches, La., in grateful recognition of the arduous and faithful service of the good darkies of Louisiana.

Mr. President, we in the South have no feeling of hatred against the Negro. We are sympathetic toward him. We understand his problems. We work with him. But what we try to do, what we have always done, and what I hope we always shall do, is to have the colored man keep his place when it comes to the social side of our associations. We do not feel that the Negroes as a race should commingle socially with the white people or marry white people, so that from that union shall come a mongrel race, as happened in Egypt, as happened in India, as has resulted in Haiti, and is happening in Harlem in the city of New York.

I shall read to the Senate some very interesting things about that very matter. It will be found from a study of history dealing with that question that when the Negro gains what he goes after by reason of sheer numbers, the first institution that goes down to destruction, as it were, that is trampled upon, that is ridiculed, is religion. In considering the early history of Egypt it will be found that the early inhabitants of Egypt believed in the immortality of the soul.

In a measure they believed in a good many principles of religion which we now believe in. But just as soon as the Negro domination occurred, the people went back to idolatry. They went back to barbaric beliefs of religion. They considered goats to be their gods. They worshiped other animals and even revered onions and other vegetables as their gods. They reverted back to dark Africa for their idols.

I am able to show through facts that the same condition resulted with respect to the Hindus. I can prove that the same situation has occurred in Haiti. I am going to show that in the United States, in Harlem, the great Father Divine, a Negro, is thought to be "God" by his followers. That shows the extent of fanaticism to which the Negro race will go if let alone. There is no place in this country of ours where they are permitted to go so far, unrestricted, other than Harlem, which is more thickly populated with Negroes than with whites. In that particular locality it seems that they are permitted to do what they please.

In the course of the debate I am going to read some of the principles advocated by Father Divine; and Lord pity Mississippi, for instance, where the Negro population is 50 percent of the total population, if Father Divine were to come down into that State, take charge of the ignorant blacks, and put his religion through. I am going to read, later on in the debate, how the present mayor of New York, Mr. LaGuardia, came to Harlem and prayed with Father Divine and his Negro congregation. There are certain very interesting occurrences that I propose to present to the Senate later on in order to prove my point and to further show that we must deal with this Negro question not from the viewpoint of politics but from a higher viewpoint. It goes beyond that. I repeat, it even goes beyond the Constitution.

I shall now read from the pages of history insofar as it affects the Hindu race and its downfall; and I am going to try to demonstrate again, as I think I have previously demonstrated with reference to the Egyptian civilization, how it tottered, how it turned to ashes, how that great civilization crumbled down to nothing, so that when the Persians conquered Egypt, instead of conquering a country having a civilization that would be such as to repay them for their conquest as spoils of war, they found nothing there. Victory meant more burdens for the Persians. The proud civilization of Egypt was no more.



Let me go back to the pages of history of India. What I read may be dry, but it is authentic. I shall refer to the book entitled "Race or Mongrel," by Schultz, the book from which I read yesterday with reference to the Egyptians.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, what is the date of the treatise, may I ask?

Mr. ELLENDER. The first impression of the book was July 1903.

I read chapter X:

#### CHAPTER X THE HINDUS

The Hindus were one of the Aryan races. That is, they belonged to the people that called themselves "Aryans" (the noble, the honorable). When they came to India, they found there a mass of yellow-black-white mongrels, and recognized that the absorption of this mass was impossible. They also recognized that crossing with these people would destroy the Hindus quickly.

Senators, that is far back, over 4,000 years ago, when those people thought as later did Jefferson, Lincoln, Clay, Webster, Grant, and as many other statesmen of more recent years have thought.

The Hindus were fanatical Aryans, and among the yellow-black-white mongrels, they developed an intense exclusiveness. They described the old inhabitants of the country as Dasyus, Rakshasas, fiendish creatures, and monsters. When allied to them, they speak of their allies as monkeys and of their king as the king of monkeys.

In the Veda we find these sentiments:

"Indra hurl thy shaft against the Dasyu, and increase the might and glory of the Arya."

"Distinguish Indra the Arya and those who are Dasyu."

"Indra having killed the Dasyu, protected the Aryan color."

"I do not give over the Aryan name to the Dasyu."

"Indra, increase the Aryan power."

"Indra, the companion of the Arya."

"Indra uncovered the light for the Arya. The Dasyus was left on the left hand."

"I gave the earth to the Arya and rain to the liberal mortals."

"The gods spread all over the earth the Aryan laws."

Arya was considered a name of honor. Darius calls himself Ariya and Ariya kitra, an Aryan and of Aryan descent. The same element enters into many Persian names, Ariaramnes, Ariobazanes, Artabages, Artaxerxes.

The Hindus recognized that, unless they took vigorous precautions, the Aryans would soon be lost in the mongrel herd. To protect themselves they invented the caste system, one of the greatest inventions of the human mind.

It is of historic record why today in India we find so many castes. In its early history the castes were established in order to preserve the purity of the whites; and although the caste system still prevails, it is not now composed of white persons, because among the castes mongrelization crept in.

The Aryans were the three upper castes, viz, the Brahmins, Cshatriyas, and Vaisyas. The classes they called varna, which meant color, and has since come to mean caste. The priests, who, among primitive people, are the observers, scientists, artists, and poets, constituted themselves the first caste, the caste of the Brahmins. They were of the purest Aryan blood. The Aryans of warlike tendencies were constituted as the Cshatriya caste, and the rest of the Hindus were constituted as the Vaisya caste, the householders, the merchants, and the cultivators of the soil.

The importance of the Vaisya caste was recognized by the Hindus. The Manava-Dharma-Sastra says: "The means of subsistence peculiar to Vaisya are merchandise, attending on cattle and agriculture; but with a view to the next life; \* \* \* with vigilant care should the king exert himself in compelling merchants and mechanics to perform their respective duties; for when such men swerve from their duty, they throw this world into confusion."

The rights of each caste were rendered hereditary and inalienable. The king himself could not abrogate the rights of caste. Outside of these three castes there were no Aryans, no twice-born men. The natives were constituted as a fourth caste, the Sudra. Their monopoly was the laborious and humble work, and their condition was better than that of the helots or serfs elsewhere; for it was strictly enjoined upon the three upper castes to treat the Sudra well. The Hindus considered it just that intelligence should rule, and that muscle should work. Their assumption, which underlies the caste system, that intelligence and the better qualities were characteristics of the Aryan and not of the Sudra, their history of 5,000 years verified.

The Hindus were never more than a small minority of the people of India; and of the people of India, the Hindus alone produced art, science, literature, civilization.

There again, Senators, this historian states—and I am going to produce more evidence to the same effect; it is here on my desk—that in India, as in Egypt, art, science, literature, and civilization progressed as long as the race main-

tained its purity; but just as soon as the nation was mongrelized it became degraded; its civilization deteriorated, as was the case in Egypt, and as I propose to show, is the case in Haiti.

I continue reading:

As the Vaisyas were not as pure Aryans as the Cshatriyas and the Cshatriyas not as pure as the Brahmins it was ordained that the different castes should not intermarry. Manava-Dharma-Sastra says: "In all classes they, and they only, who are born in a direct line of wives equal in class and virgins at the time of marriage are to be considered as the same class with their fathers. \* \* \* A woman of the servile classes is not mentioned, even in the recital of any ancient story as the wife of a Brahman or of a Cshatriya, though in the greatest difficulty to find a suitable match."

The intermarriage of the members of one caste with members of another caste was strictly prohibited.

As I have pointed out, here in America there are 18 States which permit marriages between Negroes and whites; all other States prevent such marriages. Peoples who lived away back 4,000 years before Christ were trying to prevent the same condition that I am trying to prevent here by my humble efforts, because they felt that to give the inferior civilization social equality would mean the degradation of their nation and the decay of their civilization; and they were right—

The Madana-Ratna-Pradipa says: "The marriage of twice-born men with damsels not of the same class \* \* \* these parts of ancient law were abrogated by wise legislators."

"From a Cshatriya with a wife of the Sudra class springs a creature called Ugra, with a nature partly warlike and partly servile, ferocious in his manners, cruel in his acts. \* \* \* Him who was born of a sinful mother and consequently in a low class, but is not openly known, who, though worthless in truth, bears the semblance of a worthy man, let people discover by his acts. Want of virtuous dignity, harshness of speech, cruelty, and habitual neglect of prescribed duties betray in this world the son of a criminal mother."

There were in India savage tribes unable to perform the duties of the Sudra class. These miserable tribes the Hindus called Miekha. They were also gained over to the Brahmanical system. The Brahmins went as hermits into the settlements of the Miekha, and preached their system of metempsychosis, and were cut down. Other Brahmins came to take their places. They again were killed. Still others came; and the cheerfulness with which these men went to suffering and death struck terror into the souls of the natives, who began to question, "Who are these men?"

And this answer was returned, "We are the most exalted of men; kings bow down before us. We have reached this station not without desert; and in the next life we shall become one with Brahma, the god of gods, a unit in the divine essence. In previous lives we were as miserable as you are. Believe us, be virtuous and dutiful, and you will become exalted. The virtuous Miekha is reborn as a Sudra, the virtuous Sudra as a Vaisya, the virtuous Vaisya as a Cshatriya, the virtuous Cshatriya as a Brahman, and the virtuous Brahman as one with the divinity. On the other hand, the Brahman who neglects his duties will be punished in hell and be reborn as a Sudra, a Miekha, or lower even in the scale of life." The Hindus had no eternal hell. As the son of a Sudra may thus attain the rank of a Brahman, and as the son of a Brahman may sink to the level with the Sudras, even so much it be with him who springs from a Cshatriya; even so with him who was born of a Vaisya (v. Manava-Dharma-Sastra).

The conviction of the Brahmins convinced the Miekha, and they were ready to become the lowest order of the Brahmanical system.

There were Hindus in India who disregarded the caste system, and a half-breed population began to spring up. The Hindus, intent on keeping their race pure, sought to remedy the evil. It was not always possible to strike at the parents, and so they struck at the offspring. They declared the half-breed population Chandalas. They were considered the most contemptible of the base born; their touch was polluting, a pollution of which the Cshatriya could purify himself by cutting the Chandala down. The brook that they had taken water from was cursed. Their places of refuge were to be destroyed. They were refused admission into villages and cities. That was the law. Its enforcement was prevented by the gentleness of the Hindu character. The Chandala was despised, but he lived; lived in villages that the Hindu had the right to burn down. The contempt in which the Chandala was held had this good effect: it prevented the mongrelization of the Hindus for several thousand years. History attests that the Chandala fully deserved the contempt which the Hindus entertained for him.

About 500 B. C. Gautama Sacyamuni taught Buddhism. Brahmanism demanded active virtues; Buddhism was content with passive, cloistered virtues. Brahmanism demanded self-sacrifice and work—

Remember, Senators, that was the first religion of the Hindus, and, as I pointed out a while ago, decay began in these nations first with respect to their religion. That is what suffered first. From Brahmanism they fell as low, so

far as religion is concerned, as did the Egyptians. I repeat that a change in religion is the first sign of weakness, as I have pointed out in reading the Egyptian history and as is made plain now by Hindu history—

Buddhism was satisfied with the admission of sin, and established the confession. The sinner confessed to the priest that he was a scoundrel, and he promptly became a saint. Brahmanism taught purification by faith and virtue and final union with God (eternal life). Buddhism taught the confession and eternal death. Virtue in the Brahmanical sense meant the performance of duty, faith, self-abnegation, work. Contemplation and confession satisfied the Buddhists. It was but natural that this religion of ease soon found many followers; being the religion of a yellow, it appealed to the race instincts of the yellows.

Nothing demonstrates the superiority of the whites over the yellows better than the fact that for a thousand years Buddhism existed in India, without being able to change the Brahmanical order in the least. About A. D. 500 Buddhism considered itself strong enough to supplant Brahmanism. The result was war, which finally ended in the complete expulsion of Buddhism from India. This success the Brahmanical order achieved, notwithstanding the fact that it was continuously at war with foreign enemies.

After the time of the Sultan of Ghasna, the Brahmanical society did not have a moment's peace. After Mahmud's Persians, came the Turks, the Mongols, the Afghanists, the Persians of Nadir Shah, the Portuguese, the French, and the English. None of them was able to break the Brahmanical system.

Buddhism had this baneful effect upon India—that by disregarding the caste system the Buddhists increased the Chandala class enormously. The time came when there was no family without mongrel members; the meaning of varna was forgotten.

As I illustrated with reference to the Egyptians, their downfall came because of mongrelization. There resulted a change of religion, and when that came about decay ensued. In the case of the Hindus the identical followed. The change in religion indicated that mongrelization had taken hold, and with the mongrelization of the older Aryan people the former civilization of the white people of India was doomed.

It came to mean work, occupation; and the mongrel was no longer held in contempt, but the workman. The caste system, that wonderful invention which for millenniums enabled the Hindus to remain true to themselves, to produce art, science, a great religion, civilization, has become a curse and a folly. Why should there be a caste system where all are Chandalas? The white-yellow-black mongrel is worthless. As far as the progress of civilization, the progress of man is concerned, 300,000,000 rats might as well be fed as 300,000,000 mongrels. The caste system has no power to demongrelize blood.

In the last centuries Brahmanism has degenerated rapidly, and it is now fast crumbling to pieces; not because the English are in India, but because the impetus which the Hindus, before they became extinct, gave to it is expending itself. In a like manner the Roman system outlived the death of the last Roman by several centuries. The English rule India today; and that foreigners, Aryans, should rule the degenerate offspring of the Hindus is not only just but in accordance with the Hindu scriptures: "Indra is the companion of the Arya and increases the Aryan power; Indra gives the earth to the Arya and spreads all over the earth the Aryan laws." The literature of the Hindus is the only one in India deserving of the name. Sanskrit is the only language of poetry, drama, law, philosophy.

All of this, Senators, came from the early Hindu settlers in India, as I shall show more clearly and more specifically by reading from another author:

The deterioration of the Hindus can be traced through the centuries in their art, their science, their literature, and their religion.

Many surgical operations, which we consider triumphs of modern surgery, were invented by the Hindus. They were skilled in performing amputations, lithotomy, abdominal and uterine operations; they operated for hernia, fistula, piles; they set broken bones and had specialists in rhinoplasty or operations for restoring lost ears and noses, operations which modern surgeons have borrowed from them.

Just stop and think of that, Senators! All of this scientific development was brought about in India when the Aryans were at the head of India—were in charge of its government; and, as this author states, the modern scientists in America probably have borrowed some of the means and methods of those ancients in prescribing for the sick and the injured.

Today the medical and surgical knowledge of the mongrel calling himself Hindu is nil.

Why? For the same reason that prevailed in Egypt. Here was a country which, like Egypt, had become versed in science, in surgery, in art, and which progressed; but, as shown

by the author of the book from which I have been reading, the moment that country became mongrelized and the caste system wiped out, the moment the colored race was permitted to intermarry, to permeate and become a part of the blood of the old Indian civilization, decay set in, and the medical and surgical knowledge of India became and now is nil. There was no more progress.

The Hindus invented the so-called Arabic notation of numbers, and algebra; today they have no mathematical science deserving of the name.

Just stop and think of that. They started the Arabic system of numerals, but today we here in America and the white inhabitants of other countries, picking up where the Hindu left off, have progressed and developed the system to a fine point; whereas the nation, the people that are responsible for it, could not progress because of the mongrelization of their white race with the Negro.

The later epics of the Hindus are of an artificial character. The ancient epics are great works, which abound in passages of high poetic beauty. Plays written later than the eleventh century belong to the period of decline. One of them, the Anargha-Raghava, a drama full of obscurities and of commonplace sentiments, enjoys a higher reputation with the mongrels of the present age than the masterpieces of Kalidasa. Many of these later dramas are incomplete in their dialog.

The absurdities of modern Brahmanism are known. The great Brahmins of the Sarasvati would regard it as defiled by association with the Dasyu.

The study of the literature of the Hindus taught us that the vicious practices which prevail in India are late innovations; that is, inventions of the post-Hindu mongrels. Thus the rite of suttee (cremation of the widow) sprang up as a local habit, and on becoming more prevalent received the sanction of the Brahmanical mongrels. The English stamped out the atrocious custom, and the depraved instinct of the mongrels invented the "cold suttee." The Hindu scriptures do not authorize the cremation of the widow, but bid her return to her home and resume her duties. The cow has always been held in India in high esteem. She was not, however, the "saint cow" that she now is. Today the eating of a beefsteak in India is a cardinal sin, while in Hindu times beef was an ordinary article of food.

Again, stop and think! I reiterate: The degradation of a nation apparently starts with the degradation of its religion following mongrelization. In the early history of India there was a religion that in some of its phases was somewhat similar to some of the religions that today exist in the civilized world. In early history the Hindus did not worship animals. The eating of pork, the eating of beef, was not contrary to their religion. Later on, however, when cattle and other animals became sacred gods to which these mongrels prayed, it was considered sinful to eat them; and that, emphatically, shows again, Senators, that wherever there is a decline in the civilization of a race it starts in religion. That happened in India, just as it did in Egypt.

Following the pages I have just read are very beautiful extracts from some of the poets who wrote in those early days; and, by the way, a good deal of this literature came to light less than 100 years ago through the Sanskrit language, as I shall show by another author.

With the permission of the Senate, Mr. President, I ask that, beginning where I left off on page 56, to and including page 61 of this book, be printed in connection with my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

The position of women in India today is degraded. The Mahabharata tells us of the esteem in which women were held in Mahabharata times:

"A wife is half the man, his truest friend,  
A loving wife is a perpetual spring  
Of virtue, pleasure, wealth; a faithful wife  
Is his best aid in seeking heavenly bliss;  
A sweetly speaking wife is a companion  
In solitude; a father in advice;  
A mother in all seasons of distress;  
A rest in passing through life's wilderness."

In order to clearly demonstrate the heights from which the Hindus have fallen it will be best to quote from their ancient writings; and it will be noticed that many of the Brahmanical sentiments are identical with Christian sentiments as we find them in the Gospels, an identity due to the fact that both are religions



by Aryans for Aryans. The ancient Hindus had a simple theistic creed, now innumerable gods crowd the pantheon, appealing to the instincts of the mongrels. The post-Hindu is ripe for Buddhism, for Christianity, the vegetable pantheon of the Egyptians, or any other creed that may be preached him. The mongrel, being destitute of character, can accept and adopt anything. I quote from the Bhagavad-Gita:

"Many are my births that are passed, many are thine too, Arjuna; I know them all, but thou knowest them not." (Cf. John viii:14.)

"For the establishment of righteousness am I from time to time born." (Cf. John xvii:37; John iii:3.)

"I am dearer to the wise than all possessions, and he is dear to me."

"The unbeliever, the ignorant, and he of a doubting mind perish utterly." (Cf. Mark xvi:16.)

"In him are all beings, by him this universe was spread out." (Cf. Acts xvii:28.)

"Deluded men despise me when I have taken human form." (Cf. John i:10.)

"In all the Vedas I am to be known." (Cf. John v:39.)

Read chapter XI, called "The Vision" (Krishna and Arjuna).

In Panini the Hindus have produced the greatest grammarian that ever lived, whose grammar is the great standard of Sanscrit. It is one of the most remarkable literary works that the world has ever seen, and no other country produced a grammatical system at all comparable to it, either for originality of plan or for analytical subtlety. Panini's grammar was criticized by the celebrated Katyayana. His great rival was Patanjali.

We know from the Rig-veda that the movements of the moon and its use as the time measurer were studied by the Hindus as early as 500 B. C. Aryabata knew the causes of solar and lunar eclipses, and noticed the motion of the solstitial and equinoctial points. He taught that the earth is a sphere and revolves on its own axis. To the Hindus is due the invention of algebra and its application to astronomy and geometry. They were acquainted with the properties of the magnet.

From Yajnavalkya's law book I quote:

"Some expect the whole result from destiny or from the inherent nature of things; some expect it from the lapse of time; and some from man's own effort. Other persons, of wiser judgment, expect it from a combination of all these."

"When a Brahman is a thief he must be marked with a hot iron and banished from the country."

"Whoever falsifies scales and edicts, measures or coin, or does business with them so falsified, should be made to pay the highest fine."

"Anyone who adulterates medicine, or oil, or salt, or perfume, or corn, or sugar, or other commodities, should be made to pay 16 panas."

"The highest fine should be imposed on those who, knowing the rise or fall in prices, combine to make a price of their own to the detriment of workmen and artisans."

Of the ancient Hindu epics, Monier Williams says: "Notwithstanding the wilderness of exaggeration and hyperbole through which the reader of the Indian epics has occasionally to wander, there are in the whole range of the world's literature few more charming poems than the Ramayana. The classical purity, clearness, and simplicity of its style, the exquisite touches of true poetic feeling with which it abounds, its graphic descriptions of heroic incidents and nature's grandest scenes, the deep acquaintance it displays with the conflicting workings and most refined emotions of the human heart all entitle it to rank among the most beautiful compositions that have appeared at any time or in any country. It is like a spacious and delightful garden, here and there allowed to run wild but teeming with fruits and flowers, watered by perennial streams, and even its most tangled thickets intersected with delightful pathways."

The following sentiments are found in the Ramayana and in the Mahabharata:

"Even to foes who visit us as guests  
Due hospitality should be displayed;  
The tree screens with its leaves the man who fells it.

"This is the sum of all true righteousness:  
Treat others as thou wouldst thyself be treated.  
Do nothing to thy neighbor which hereafter  
Thou wouldst not have thy neighbor do to thee.  
In causing pleasure or in giving pain,  
In doing good or injury to others,  
In granting or refusing a request,  
A man obtains a proper rule of action  
By looking on his neighbor as himself.

"No being perishes before his time,  
Though by a hundred arrows pierced; but when  
His destined moment comes, though barely pricked  
By a sharp point of grass, he surely dies.

"He by whose hands the swans were painted white,  
And parrots green, and peacocks many hued,  
Will make provisions for thy maintenance.

"Strive not too anxiously for a subsistence;  
Thy maker will provide thee sustenance.  
No sooner is a human being born,  
Than milk for his support streams from the breast."

—Hitopadesa, Monier Williams.

Of Hindu dramatists, Kalidasa and Bhavabhuti are superior to most of the western poets. Kalidasa's "Sakuntala" drew unqualified praise from Göthe, in the following words:

"Wouldst thou the young year's blossoms and the fruit of its decline,

And all by which the soul is charmed, enraptured, feasted, fed?

Wouldst thou the earth and heaven itself in one sole name combine?

I name thee, Sakuntala, and all at once is said."

—Monier Williams.

The Hindus were a great race. Their death was a loss to the world, a loss that it is impossible to overestimate. Men who call themselves Hindus still exist, Sanscrit derivatives are still spoken, the Hindu spirit, however, is dead; the noble blood has been lost in the Indian quagmire, in the yellow-black-white swamp.

It would seem that nothing in this world could bring about the deterioration and degradation of as great a race as the Hindu race; but bastardization, mongrelization, continued throughout many centuries, has done it.

The history of the Hindus, like that of the Jews, proves that race is more important than home, country, flag, and everything else put together.

Great was the Hindu; worthless is the mongrel.

Read Indian Wisdom, by Monier Williams; The Inequality of the Human Races, by A. Conte de Gobineau; Volkstum und Weltmacht in der Geschichte, by Albrecht Wirth.

NOTE.—The translations are from Monier Williams, Indian Wisdom.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I have been reading from Schultz, who, as I stated, is an authority on the mongrel.

Mr. POPE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield before he leaves that point?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question; yes, sir.

Mr. POPE. I observe that the Senator has considered India and Egypt. Of course, nearly all the great nations of ancient times have fallen. I refer to Greek, Rome, Persia, and other nations. Does the Senator consider that the matter he has discussed was the most important thing leading to the fall of the ancient nations?

Mr. ELLENDER. The nations that I have mentioned; yes, certainly. There were other nations, such as Greece, whose fall was due to other things. When Hannibal conquered the world, it was brute force that accomplished it. In those localities there was another branch of the white race, the Mediterraneans, mentioned yesterday by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SCHWARTZ], who occupied and developed, as it were, southern Europe. In other words, they were more influential in the development of southern Europe than the others I have named. The decay I have spoken about, with reference to Egypt and with reference to India, has been caused, in my opinion, solely by the mongrelization of the race. It may have been affected in later years by war, and it was later affected by war, because when the Persians and the Assyrians fought with the Egyptians, what happened? At the time of the attack, Egypt had become mongrelized.

There were a few Greeks there who had settled among the Egyptians. The members of the mongrelized nation fled, surrendered, and the Greeks were the only ones who offered resistance to the Persians when attacked. These mongrels had no courage, had no pride of country, but fled as would a tribe in the wilds of Africa.

Mr. POPE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. POPE. Does the Senator think the fall of Greece and the fall of Rome were due to any sort of race amalgamation?

Mr. ELLENDER. No, sir; I do not believe so. It is my recollection that the fall of those countries was due to being overpowered by the people of other countries, and not to mongrelization. Greece is still there, though, of course, Greece is not progressing as a whole to the same extent as it did in days of old. She has remained to a certain extent stagnant. I was not able to give the reasons for that to the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SCHWARTZ], because, as I remember, he made the point that the Mediterraneans may have occupied Egypt, the point being that the Mediterraneans, a branch of the white race occupied the greater portion of southern Europe. Whether or not the Mediterranean race, that part of the white race which settled in

southern Europe, was at one time a mongrel race, I do not know, but I am going to look it up.

I doubt, however, that it was a mongrel race. Some ethnologists believe that although a race may at one time be mongrelized to a minor extent, its mongrelization can be wiped out in the course of time by a preponderance of pure blood. In other words, ethnologists believe, and I think historians agree, that if there is but little mongrelization in a country that in the course of years the mongrel blood can be wiped out through absorption by the pure blood of the others. As to whether or not the Mediterraneans who occupied southern Europe were ever at any time considered a mongrelized race I do not know; but basing my statement on the facts brought out in histories I have read, I know that the Aryan race, the Nordics, are pure; and it was the Nordic race, known as the Aryans, pure whites, that occupied northern Europe and came to Egypt and also to India.

Mr. President, I desire to quote further now from an author from whom I quoted yesterday, who apparently has made a very careful study of the subject. He has studied it from every standpoint, and in the extracts I shall read he has incorporated certain passages from other sources of Indian history. It is very interesting to note that the same thing that has occurred in Egypt has occurred in India to the same extent and along the same lines, and I hope that the few Senators who are present and all the Members of the House of Representatives and all the pages who are present will listen to me, and, of course, I hope the ladies and gentlemen in the galleries will pay attention to what I say. I know they are all very much interested in Indian history, and I trust they will listen very carefully.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHWARTZ in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. LEWIS. I wish to announce to the able Senator from Louisiana that the fact that there are few Senators on the floor, as he has stated, does not indicate a lack of appreciation on their part of the Senator's remarks, but their absence is due to the fact that they are engaged in committees which call them to other official duties.

Mr. ELLENDER. I did not mean to cast any reflection on the Senators who are not present. I know they are all busy and very much occupied, and I have nothing to say in that regard. Of course, personally I do not blame them much for not being here, but I should certainly enjoy their company if they could be present and listen to historical and undeniable facts with reference to this question.

I shall now read from *White America*, by Cox, the same authority from whom I read yesterday. I read at page 130:

The briefest survey of the Aryan conquest of India will suffice to show that the white Aryan came into contact with a decayed civilization which was in its last stages as a result of the previous Caucasian conquerors of India having interbred with the aborigines. The breed which produced the earlier culture had become submerged in the black mass about them, and the new-coming Aryan found that the "melting pot" had prepared India for an easy conquest. The Aryans, by reason of race and culture, came as aristocrats. Their numbers were but small when compared with the colored multitudes about them. They came slowly from their homeland in the northwest where, in spite of later mixtures with blacks and yellows, we yet find Afghans and Persians who are fundamentally Aryan.

While all the darker strains of India may not be traced to the influence of the blood of the Asiatic branch of the Negro race, which at an early time was widely distributed on the Asiatic mainland and which now has many representatives in the islands south of the continent, yet the blood of the Negro is evident in certain of the races of India.

Speaking of the race types of India, Madison Grant says: "The Aryanized Afghan and Hindu of northern India speak languages derived from old Sanskrit and are closely related to the Mediterranean race. Aside from common dolichocephaly, these peoples are entirely distinct from the Dravidians of south India, whose speech is agglutinative and who show strong evidence of profound mixture with the ancient Negrito substratum of southern Asia. Everywhere throughout the Asiatic portion of its range the Mediterranean race overlies an even more ancient negroid race. These negroids still have representatives among the pre-Dravidians of India, the Ved-dahs of Ceylon, the Sakai of the Malay Peninsula, and the natives of the Andaman Islands."

The all but complete disappearance of the blood of the white civilizers of India is well expressed by the same authority, who says: "The Hindu today speaks a very ancient form of the Aryan language, but there remains not one recognizable trace of the white conquerors who poured in through the passage of the northwest. The boast of the modern Indian that he is of the same race as his English ruler is entirely without basis in fact, and the little swarthy native lives among the monuments of a departed grandeur, professing the religion and speaking the tongue of his long-forgotten Nordic conquerors without the slightest claim to blood kinship. The dim and uncertain traces of Nordic blood in northern India only serve to emphasize the utter swamping of the white man in the burning South."

Not only were the eastern Aryans, before amalgamation with other races, true representatives of the race type that has dominated civilization, but also it is from this branch of the race that we have received important arts and sciences, and to their ancient literature we are indebted for much that we know concerning the religious beliefs of our kindred, their social organization, their laws, and race ideals.

The ancient literature of the Aryan is embodied in the Rig-Veda and the Epics. The Vedic times cover approximately the six hundred years intervening between 2000 B. C. and 1400 B. C. These writings afford us a fair conception of Aryan society and reveal a vigorous, white, conquering people, well organized, respecting their women, already in possession of ancient laws, glorying in agriculture, passionately religious, imposing their faith and culture upon the surrounding colored populations to whom they refer in terms of contempt. Themselves they designate as a people of "fair complexion" and term those whom they have subdued "colored," and ridicule them, calling them monkeys, just as the Aryans 4,000 years later have gone into Africa, Asia, Oceania, and the Americas, have boasted of their white complexion and vigorous mentality, and have accredited the dark races of these lands with close relatedness to chimpanzee and gorilla.

Let us look backward over a span of 40 centuries and get a glimpse of these white invaders of northern India. Their records tell us that they were of fair complexion, with straight, well-bridged noses. The latter feature, as well as the complexion, marked them as a separate people and so impressed social ideals that, even to the present day, a man's social position varies in inverse ratio to the width of his nose; "that is to say, the nasal index, as it is called, is a safe guide to the amount of Aryan, as distinguished from the aboriginal blood in his veins." The tall, fair, high-nosed invader came as a conqueror, looked upon the mongrel and black multitudes as inferiors, and treated them as such. Of this treatment, however, we shall learn later.

Emerging from the hill country of Afghanistan and the slopes of the Hindu Kush, the Aryans (Nordics) took possession of that extremely desirable portion of India known as the Punjab. A glance at the map will show that the Punjab is a well-watered northern province and that it comprises but a small proportion of the present Indian empire. From the Punjab these blond Caucasians extended their sway, imposing themselves by force and the influence of superior culture upon the mix-breeds who infested the country in countless numbers then as they do now. We may better understand the ease with which this was done by the first Aryan invaders of India by reflecting upon the ease with which foreign control has been imposed by the last Aryan invaders of India, the English. The task of the first Aryan invaders should have been even less difficult; for their invasion was by land from an adjoining territory while the English have dominated India from afar, their line of communications consisting of a long and tortuous sea route. Both the first and last invasions were wrought by the hard-drinking, hard-fighting military caste of Aryans; and both invasions maintained by prestige of race and culture rather than by constant appeal to arms.

When occupying the Punjab the Aryans did not expel the mix-breed white-yellow-black populations whom they conquered. (As yet the Aryans were not in contact with the blacks in the south of India.) Throughout the history of their conquests the Aryans have not expelled a subjugated people whom they could profitably enslave. Modern Aryans in North America did expel the red man, but they imported the black.

I am sure the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], who is doing me the honor to follow what I am reading, will agree with me that when the black man first came to this country he came here as a worker. The American Indian was already here. He was of lazy temperament and depended for his food upon that which grew wild throughout the land and that which he could gather with the least effort. He did not try to elevate himself prior to the time the white man came to America, nor after, except through the aid of the whites. As a matter of fact the American Indian depended entirely on what he found growing wild in this country for his food. He might have planted a little corn, but there was no real sign of progress on the part of the American Indian, and he was never employed by the first white settlers here because he was not of the type that would work. Hence as agriculture developed, it became necessary to bring slaves into this country. That is why the slave



traffic developed. From my knowledge of early American history I am sure that if it were not for the importation of the Negroes the South would not have developed agriculturally as fast as it did. We had no labor-saving inventions at that time such as we have today. In those days we had to depend on muscle and brawn in order to cultivate and make the crop. It required a great amount of labor. I am sure the Senator from North Carolina will agree with me in that statement.

Before I leave the American Indian I do not mean that he was devoid of any civilization. Some recent discoveries were made showing that there was quite a progressive Indian civilization before Columbus landed. I may be wrong in that statement, but that is my recollection.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I might add, in view of the fact that the Senator is speaking of the early settlers of this country, the original ones, the Indians, that he will find a book entitled "The Northwest Passage" an extremely interesting volume, which describes the adventures of Major Rogers in his search for the Northwest Passage. In that book the Indians of that particular portion of the United States are described very vividly and most interestingly.

Of course, in North Carolina, as the Senator knows, and in the country from which our colleague the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS] comes, we have the Cherokee Indians, and, as a matter of fact, the Cherokee Indians are considered among the very best tribes of Indians of America.

In the Western States are to be found the Pawnee Indians, and the Sioux Indians, and different Indian tribes. I was wondering if the Senator from Louisiana had ever visited western North Carolina, where the Cherokee Indians are to be found?

Mr. ELLENDER. I will say to the Senator that I have visited it quite frequently.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I hope the Senator will find it possible to return to North Carolina, because since his last visit there we have established the Great Smoky Mountains National Park, which is only a stone's throw from the city in which I live, which city is Asheville, N. C., the little gem city of the mountains.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have visited your Gem City, Senator, and as an American I am very proud of it.

I shall continue reading from this author:

We may better understand the ease with which this was done by the first Aryan invaders of India, by reflecting upon the ease with which foreign control has been imposed by the last Aryan invaders of India, the English.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I see the Senator is reading some very interesting chapters with regard to the development of India. Does the Senator know how the English happened to be able to conquer that vast territory of India, from the Malay States north to the great frontier of Afghanistan? Does the Senator recall—this is in the form of a question—that when first the English went into the Orient they made a trade with one of the tribes to aid them in defeating the people of another province, and after that defeat was brought about they made a trade with those whom they had just defeated to fight with other tribes against whom they had previously fought, and then when those tribes were defeated they would make similar trades with them, and so on through the entire conquest of India? I am told that that is the manner in which the British were able to conquer all of India.

Mr. ELLENDER. In answer to the question of the Senator from North Carolina, I may state that I do now remember reading that part of the history of India, but that particular phase of it had escaped my recollection, and I am glad that the Senator has made the contribution he has at this time.

I continue to read:

The task of the first Aryan invaders should have been even less difficult; for their invasion was by land from an adjoining territory, while the English have dominated India from afar, their line of communications consisting of a long and tortuous sea route.

Both the first and last invasions were wrought by the hard-drinking, hard-fighting military caste of Aryans, and both invasions maintained by prestige of race and culture rather than by constant appeal to arms.

When occupying the Punjab, the Aryans did not expel the mixed white-yellow-black populations whom they conquered (as yet the Aryans were not in contact with the blacks in the south of India). Throughout the history of their conquests, the Aryans have not expelled a subjugated people whom they could profitably enslave. Modern Aryans in North America did expel the red man, but they imported the black. The former would not work, the latter could be made to work.

The very thing that I discussed a minute ago prevailed in India as it did in this country; the importation of the black was necessary because the black could be made to work, and the natives were too lazy to work.

If we, from the vantage point of centuries, pass critical judgment upon the color policies of the Indian Aryans, we may ask ourselves in what did they fail and to what mistake is their final undoing attributable? We know that their failure must be attributed to their reliance upon caste, rather than expulsion, in dealing with their colored subjects. They sought to keep themselves white by imposing laws against race admixture and supporting such laws by the ideal of race purity and by religion. But long continued race contact, throughout human history, is written large in one word—amalgamation.

"Amalgamation!" That is what we in America must prevent. I hope that we can do what Jefferson said was impossible to do—keep the races separate. As I pointed out yesterday, Jefferson—back in 1806, I think, in the early days of our American history—said he could foresee that in the future it would be impossible for the white race and the colored race to live separately in the same country; that one would have to prevail over the other, and he was afraid that the Negro might prevail, and then our civilization would become degraded.

Another thing feared by Jefferson and feared by others of our American statesmen at that time, and even by our modern statesmen, was the amalgamation of the two races; and amalgamation was the very thing that the early Indian people feared way back 3,000 years before Christ. Those people of that period viewed the question in the same light as I am viewing it now. I am simply giving facts. As I said a while ago, I do not know whether this discussion is interesting to Senators or not. I hope that it is. I hope they will pay attention to what I am saying; because I am just as sincere and as confident as I am of anything that what I have just said will come to pass in this country if we do not take steps to prevent it. I am not going to live to see it, but just as sure as I am being heard by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], who sits within 3 feet from here, if there is an amalgamation of the races, decay of our civilization will surely follow; and amalgamation cannot be stopped, in my mind, if we permit the colored people to keep on encroaching on the whites socially. Political power will bring it about. The Negro may some day become so strong politically that he will be able to command respect for his vote, and he may come to the Senate. Perhaps not next year; perhaps not in the next 50 years; but some day he may come here and probably sit in the seat in which the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BERRY] is now sitting and which seat was once occupied by the immortal Webster, or in the seat in which the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] is now sitting, or maybe he will sit in the seat once occupied by the illustrious President of the Southern Confederacy, Jeff Davis.

It is not necessary to stretch our imagination to surmise what is going to happen should that ever occur. Then watch the social legislation that will be passed! Just as sure as the sun is overhead, the amalgamation of the white race in this country with the colored race is going to bring to America what it brought to Egypt, what it brought to India, what it brought to Haiti, and what in a small measure it is bringing to Harlem in New York, as I am going to show by the doings of Father Divine, a Negro.

Mr. REYNOLDS. The Senator, of course, appreciates the fact that there are exceptions?

Mr. ELLENDER. Oh, I appreciate that, Senator.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I wondered if the Senator was aware of the fact that a great portion of the slaves that were taken to South America were Chinese slaves, as a matter of fact. Whereas we in America experienced the importation of thousands upon thousands of slaves from various and sundry parts of Africa, the people of South America experienced an importation of thousands upon thousands of Chinese slaves.

Mr. ELLENDER. Of the Mongolian race?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Of the Mongolian race. In connection with exceptions, of course, we all have from time to time on the floor of the Senate mentioned exceptions in the colored race. It might be interesting for the Senator to recall the life history of the Emperor of Haiti, whose name, I think, was Christophe.

Mr. ELLENDER. Christophe; I have his history here and I propose to discuss it later on today.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Has the Senator visited Haiti? If not, I hope the Senator at some time will take advantage of the opportunity to visit Christophe citadel, which is right on top of the mountain overlooking the point of Haiti.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have not visited Haiti. But Christophe, the Emperor of Haiti, whom the Senator has just mentioned, was the son of a Negro slave, and there was no Chinese blood in his veins.

Mr. REYNOLDS. None whatever. He built there at the foot of the mountain San Souci Palace, in which he lived, did he not?

Mr. ELLENDER. I am coming to that; I have it all here.

Mr. REYNOLDS. And when he completed that citadel and fortress it is said that he caused the murder of the engineers who had charge of its construction, so that they would not be able to reveal anything about it or its history, did he not?

Mr. ELLENDER. I have that complete history.

Mr. REYNOLDS. It is very interesting, the Senator will agree, I am sure?

Mr. ELLENDER. I may say, while we are on the subject, that I am going to invite not only the Senators and Members of the House but I am going to invite the pages of the Senate, the clerks, the official reporters, the members of the press, the colored people who may be in the galleries, the white people—everybody—to read at the first opportunity—they can read it at the Congressional Library, if they do not have it—Black Majesty—a book on Haiti, showing what Negro domination has done to Haiti.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMATHERS in the chair). The Senator will state it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Vice President made a statement this morning regarding what constitutes a legitimate interruption under the rules and what kind of an interruption would terminate a Senator's right to the floor. I am not seeking to take the Senator from Louisiana from the floor, but I am curious to know whether the inquiries submitted by the Senator from North Carolina do not fall under the inhibition announced this morning by the Vice President.

Mr. ELLENDER. I desire to state that, as I understand, Mr. President, the Senator from North Carolina asked a question as to whether I was familiar with Christophe. That was the question asked me, and I proceeded to answer it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I should like to hear what the Chair has to say on the subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator having the floor is entitled to yield only for a question. The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] having framed his statement in the form of a question, it falls within the rule.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I did not hear the Senator's question when I entered; he was on the tail end of a dissertation.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes, I will yield for a question, but be sure to make it a question. [Laughter.]

Mr. REYNOLDS. Will the Senator also discuss the life history of Trujillo, president of the Dominican Republic? The Dominican Republican, as the Senator will recall—and I make this statement in the form of a question—occupies a part and portion of the same island upon which we find the Republic of Haiti?

Mr. ELLENDER. I will yield to the Senator for a question, and am happy to yield to him, but I am very anxious that anything the Senator desires to ask me be put in the form of a question, because I should not like to lose the opportunity of continuing this discussion. I do not know whether or not it is interesting to the Senator from North Carolina or to other Members of the Senate, but to me it is deeply interesting. It may not be interesting to some others, I presume, for the reason that it is a little bit dry unless one appreciates the full meaning of it as it is developed, point by point. Of course, Senators who come in and then leave the Chamber from time to time—and I do not blame them for that—and listen for just a little while, may not find it interesting.

I made the point a little while ago that amalgamation of the white race with the colored race was, in my opinion, the cause of the downfall and decadence of the civilization of India, and also was the cause of the decadence of Egypt, and before the Senator from Michigan came in I pointed out that the question of amalgamation bothered Thomas Jefferson, bothered Lincoln, and bothered Grant. They were afraid of it.

What I am trying to do at present is to bring the facts home, so that the American people today—not tomorrow but now—may see, in white and black, what happened to other civilizations of the past, and understand that other civilizations of the past thought along the same line as our own Jefferson thought 125 years ago, and our own Lincoln and our own Stephen A. Douglas thought more than 75 years ago. Those American statesmen feared amalgamation and its inevitable consequences, as did the statesmen of India and Egypt in the days before Christ. As I pointed out yesterday, the Egyptians were so afraid of amalgamation with the Negroes that they made it a capital offense for them to come into their country. India also desired to go that far in order to preserve her civilization.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question. If it is not a question, stop him, Mr. Presiding Officer. [Laughter.]

Mr. REYNOLDS. Speaking of Egypt, did the Senator know that when the Egyptians let down their immigration bars, from that moment the strength of the Egyptians began to fail, and as a nation, great at that time, it began to decline?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct. The trouble is the immigration bars were not in effect as early as they should have been.

Mr. President, I will recur to the question that was asked me a while ago by the able Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS]. The Senator asked me a question with reference to the immigration of Chinese into South America and the effect of such immigration.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield in that connection?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I will ask a question. Did the able Senator from Louisiana know that one of the greatest slave markets the world has ever known was at Truxillo, Peru—a Chinese slave market?

Mr. ELLENDER. I have read about it, and that brings up the point I wish to mention in answer to the Senator's question that he propounded to me a while ago. The difference between the slaves of the Mongolian race who were brought to South America and those Negro slaves that were distributed throughout the world is that the Mongolian slaves



showed a higher type of mentality than did the Negroes. The Mongolian race, as I am sure the Senator will agree, was further advanced in civilization than was the Negro race. Of course, deterioration set in when the Mongolians mixed with the whites, but it required a longer span of time before the mongrelization took effect so as to deteriorate the civilization. We must not forget that that is one of the essential differences between the mongrelization by the purely African type of Negro as compared to the mongrelization growing out of the enslavement of members of the Mongolian race. Authorities, however, are agreed to the effect that the mongrelization of races, even with the Chinese or the Japanese with the whites, will in course of time mean deterioration and decay of civilization wherever and whenever it occurs. Have I answered the question of the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Yes; and I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. ELLENDER. I continue reading:

The story of civilization is, in the main, the story of the Aryan race and its culture. The history of the Aryan peoples shows that where they have seemingly been most cruel in their dealings with other races, their civilization has been most permanent. Of the Nordic tribes who, between the fourth and the sixth centuries of our era, overran south Europe, those that became isolated and finally lost by amalgamation with their subjects rapidly declined as cultural factors; while those who replaced conquered peoples have led in civilization. Franks, Lombards, and Saxons retained race and cultural capacity. The Aryan conquerors of South America, to a great extent, have amalgamated with colored subjects. The settlers of North America segregated the colored race they found in possession of the land and have established a form of caste to prevent blood admixture with the colored race which they inducted into their midst. Caste will not perpetuate the civilization of the whites who dwell with colored races, but it will prolong it.

The Aryans of India relied upon caste. They knew that they owed their capacity in the civilized arts to their breed, and to their breed they owed their prestige among colored races. How to preserve breed and, at the same time, utilize inferior peoples to do their labor was the problem confronting the Aryans. The answer to the problem was "caste, enforced by law and religion."

The priests were the scientists and philosophers, and they devised a system of social control designed to meet the requirements of the native problem. This extraordinary scheme has been classed among the greatest expressions of human ingenuity. Caste, as originally instituted, divided the population into four divisions—warriors, priests, agriculturists, and merchants and laborers. The first was composed of those of the purest Aryan descent, while the last was made up mainly of the subjugated mixed breeds with whom the Aryan was in immediate contact. The heart of caste was not vocation, as at present, but endogamy (marriage within the caste). There were large groups of the subjugated population whom the Aryans did not honor with caste. These were referred to collectively as outcasts, recognized as barely human.

Mr. President, I ask that the remainder of page 137, which is very interesting, and all of page 138, up to and including the words "was authorized to kill" on page 139, may be inserted in the RECORD in connection with my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

We see, then, a white people dwelling among a colored, who greatly outnumber them, and attempting to remain white by the institution of laws forbidding interracial marriage. "Our first glimpse of India discloses two races struggling for the soil, the Dravidians, a dark-skinned race of aborigines, and the Aryans, a fair-skinned people, descending from the northwest passages." Keane, in his *Ethnology*, says: "As a rule, the Anglo-Saxon and British Aryan, who are by far the most numerous and widespread out of Europe, do not amalgamate with the aborigines." This author is comparing the Saxon Aryan with Spanish, French, and Portuguese "Aryans," who readily mix with colored races. But Saxon resistance to intermixture is relative only. The Saxon mixes with other races in every land where there is race contact. This mixing is slow, but the end will be the same. The same authority, on another page, himself affirms that the end of all race contact is amalgamation of races.

The Anglo-Saxon of the United States, like his early kinsmen in India, will retain comparative purity for many generations. Like his ancient relative, he invokes law to prevent interbreeding of white and black. But the present-day white man is not as well fortified against miscegenation as the ancient white man of India, who supplemented legal prohibition of marriage with nonwhites by his religious teaching and by caste, which was perfect in ideal and enforceable by law. In the United States legal prohibition of interracial marriage has not been written in the statutes of all the States; and, too, we have a religion which, instead of opposing inter-

breeding with the inferior races within our midst, is interpreted by large numbers of whites in such manner as to minimize or abolish the color line.

But the peril to the color line in India, as in the United States, was not legal interbreeding of races. There as here it was the illegitimate mixbreed who threatened the purity of the white race.

There has ever been a deplorable freedom between the white and nonwhite races, which has resulted in an increasing number of mixbreeds. In India caste prevented interracial marriage but was incapable of preventing illegitimate unions. The Aryans, intent upon retaining race purity, yet unable to restrain men of their race from unions with colored women, and in most instances unable to discover the guilty white, turned with a terrible wrath upon the helpless mixbreed. The half-castes were not permitted to reside within the limits of the city; were reviled by all, both black and white; and, finally, the Aryan laws provided that under certain conditions the soldiers might slay them without mercy. It is evident that such extreme measures would not be permanently enforced, most of all by men of the Aryan race, whose history is generally marked by tolerance to races and creeds. In spite of legal restrictions the mixbreeds increased. Caste prolonged race purity but did not preserve it. The modern Aryan in India is just such a mixture as the ancient Aryan was authorized to kill.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I continue reading from that point:

Of the "220,000,000" so-called Aryans of India, it is not likely that one-tenth of 1 percent are whites of the Aryan race. "Even the haughty Rajputs, formerly of the Kshatriya (military) caste, have long lost their racial purity and are now largely intermingled with Bhils and other primitive non-Aryans" (Keane). "Men who call themselves Hindus still exist, Sanskrit derivatives are still spoken, but the Hindu spirit, however, is dead; the noble blood has been lost in the Indian quagmire, in the yellow-black-white swamp."

Races dwelling in common territory will eventually amalgamate; and by observing the present, we are conscious that a slow amalgamation of white with nonwhite is occurring even in Saxon circles, and we know that amalgamation has already proved the end of hope in many Latin possessions. With the present in mind, we are able to understand the problems confronting ancient India and realize the Aryan's hopeless task in seeking to institute laws and customs that would perpetuate his breed and the civilization which proceeded from his breed, and which perished with it. The history of race contact will establish that the Aryans undertook an impossible task. They brought religion, law, and caste to their aid, the most carefully devised agencies the world has known. But the human intellect has never proved equal to the task of regulating sex relations.

In Indian history, as in Egyptian, we find that the further back we go the greater the culture. This is explainable on the basis of breed. These civilizations were founded by Caucasian peoples, who eventually were replaced by, or became mixed with, their colored subjects. That their cultures had a Caucasian origin is a matter beyond doubt.

Just as I have explained to the Senate, not only from these extracts but also from two other authorities from which I read today and yesterday.

To make clear the causation of their decay, we may bring to bear numerous analogous instances from both ancient and modern history. We have the Greek and Roman cultures and those of Central and Northern Latin America, which were implanted by a breed and declined with the breed which implanted them. There was gradual submergence of the creative breeds into the noncreative, which, in all instances, were more numerous.

Let us look to the high state from which the Aryans of India fell, and we may appreciate the loss to civilization. It was only about a century ago that the western world began to realize the riches of the Sanskrit literature and the ancient glory of the Hindus. When the ancient treasures of the whites of India were translated, Europeans were struck with amazement to learn that their own language was that of the civilizers of India and that the civilizers of India were a white people with a culture so deep and varied and of such ancient origin as to suggest that India was the home of the Aryan peoples and that western arts and creeds had been derived from Asia. We know now that the Aryans of India, like those of modern America and Australia, were conquering invaders, and that, like those of America and Australia, they carried their culture with them and imposed it upon colored races.

In other words, Senators, the same thing to which I referred yesterday and the day before happened to the enslaved inhabitants of those countries, to the same extent that it happened to the enslaved Negroes of North America. I made the point, and history shows, that slavery was a terrible drawback to this country, that it was wrong, painfully wrong, for us ever to have had it; but so far as the Negro race is concerned, I will say to the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], they benefited by it, because they were brought from dark Africa to the light of our American civilization.

Not only did that occur in America, as I have just stated, but it likewise occurred in India and in Egypt. The only civilization ever known to those people who came from dark Africa was the civilization they got when they came within the borders of Egypt, India, America, and other civilized places to which they were taken as slaves. The author from whom I am reading, as I say, is another authority who stands back of that statement, and shows, insofar as India is concerned, that the enslavement of the Negro from Ethiopia who came to India, although he came in bondage, resulted in his own betterment, while it resulted in the degradation of the country to which he came.

Listen to this:

Hindu history reveals that it was the early invaders, not their mongrel offspring, who displayed affinity in ideals, race, and culture to the Europeans of the days preceding steam and electricity. However alien the Saxon student may feel when poring over Egyptian and Assyrian records, he has consciousness of kinship with these tall, high-nosed, aggressive warriors, priests, and people, who emerge from obscurity upon the banks of the Indus, spread gradually to domination of the great Indian peninsula, carry their culture at a later date to Ceylon and Cambodia, and, after centuries of effort to retain race purity, gradually subside into the mongrel mass.

The Aryans opposed the colored peoples whom they conquered, not only on the ground of race, but on the basis of religion as well.

Why? Because the religion that prevailed in the country whence these slaves came was a religion based on idolatry, the worship of onions, the belief that goats are gods, that elephants are gods, that cattle are gods, as I pointed out in other parts of this discussion. It was when these religions were transplanted, when they supplanted the religion which formerly prevailed in the civilized country, that the degradation of the civilization of that country began. That is when the decline first became noticeable; and that is why I quoted yesterday from the Bible, from the twentieth chapter of Isaiah, in which the prophet Isaiah predicted the downfall of Egypt because no doubt of the mongrelization of the white Egyptian people with the colored race.

The colored "were abhorrent to the Aryans on account of their blacker blood and their unorthodox religion." Knowledge of the religion to which the Aryans objected will give justification for their opposition. Along with barbaric superstitions—

By the way, I want to digress here for a minute. This author says, "Along with their barbaric superstitions." The actions of these colored people, with their barbaric superstitions, are what gave rise, as I said, to the conditions that have been described. The time when it became noticeable in Egypt and among the Hindus that their civilization was going to pieces was when these mongrelized people began to change the dominant religion of the country; and I am sure I can bring this statement home to Senators, not only from Egyptian history, not only from Indian history, not only from Haitian history, but from Harlem history, from the actions of Father Divine.

Will you believe me when I tell you that the volumes I now exhibit to the Senate, the volumes which I hold in my hand, four in number, and also a great number of magazine articles, were all written about this Negro, "Father Divine," who, it appears, is the kingpin of Harlem so far as religion is concerned? I want to read parts of them to the Senate. I do not know whether I shall have time to do so today or tomorrow; but I am going to read to the Senate from these books and articles, and I am going to show the people of America and the Senators who are present and everybody within the hearing of my voice how Father Divine, and all his followers in Harlem and throughout the country, thought he was divine, thought he was God, and yet after all he was only the son of a Negro slave from Georgia, as I am going to show.

I want to demonstrate to the people of America that what I am reading here, the warning I am trying to give, is timely and applicable today right here in America. God pity the South, God pity the State of Mississippi and its fine people, where there are as many blacks as whites, if this thing ever spreads to that part of the country! I should hate to see Father Divine take possession of the Negro pop-

ulation of Mississippi and make them rise to religious frenzy and fanaticism as he has been able to do in Harlem. When I say Harlem, I mean Harlem in New York, here in dear America.

I desire to read to the Senate some passages from these volumes to show how some of the politicians of New York, including the present mayor of New York, solicited the support and the vote of Father Divine because he could deliver a great many votes of the members of his cult. Whether or not he succeeded, I do not know. I say, that whenever such solicitations were made promises may not have been exacted by Father Divine, but the politicians back of him, who were his "angels," doubtless said, "Divine, it's all right for you to support Mr. So-and-So and Mr. So-and-So for de mayor or for de legislature, but be sure that when So-and-So is elected to de legislature in New York, wese goin' to get social equality with the white folks."

Social equality with the whites! That, Senators, is what I fear may come to pass in this country. I repeat what I have heretofore said. Let me read it again from my notes, so that it will sink in:

Political equality leads to social equality, and social equality will eventually spell the decay and downfall of the American civilization.

Think of that proposition! Discuss it with your friends. Study the books I have referred to and I am certain you will become convinced.

I continue reading:

Along with barbaric superstitions, the Dravidians practiced a cult of gross obscenity and followed these religious observances with debauchery of unrestricted passion. Also, the Dravidians recognized only the mother as head of the family, their practices being such as to render this custom the only satisfactory way to determine kinship. Now, the Dravidians were the mongrel remains of the previous civilization that had perished in India, and represented a far more capable type of humanity than the blacks about them and to the south. The Aryans found the best of India steeped in inexpressible obscenity, and of this, as well as of the colored blood, they felt abhorrence.

To the religion of India the Aryans opposed their own, and with much success so long as they remained white. The religion of the Indian Aryan had much in common with that of our European ancestors prior to the introduction of Christianity; and if we look to their religion we find that the Aryans of 30 centuries ago held high ideals, many of which it would be difficult to improve. They believed fervently in immortality, though the immortality was to be obtained by works rather than by faith. They believed firmly in the incarnation of God walking as man upon earth, that such incarnation had been accomplished, and they looked forward to the return to earth of this same Redeemer incarnate.

The ancient laws of India (Institutes of Manu) represent an attempt to codify Hindu law just as the Code of Justinian represents the codification of the laws of certain Western Aryans. There is much in agreement between them, and the latter were probably well known to the Roman jurists. In these laws and throughout the Vedic hymns there is not a trace "of the many deplorable beliefs, traditions and customs, which in later years have debased the religious and social life of India; nor is there idolatry in the ancient religion such as characterizes the present, nor caste, nor enforced widowhood; neither is there any trace of, nor the faintest shred of authority for, either suttee or child marriage."

The early Hindu prayed to the god "who comprehended all things," "Take me to the immortal and imperishable abode where light dwells eternal." "They still felt the impulse of wonder" and looked into immeasurable space "full of blazing and self-luminous worlds." (Steele.) The Institutes of Manu teach that of "all duties, the principal is to acquire a true knowledge of one supreme god; that it is the most exalted of all sciences because it insures immortality."

Thus at the very opening of recorded Aryan history, say 4,000 years ago, we find the men of our race in possession of the most exalted religious concepts—the theory of one all-powerful god; of god become incarnate for man's sake; of a miraculous birth of this incarnate god; and an expectation of the reincarnation of this same god. They prayed, fasted, and watched for his reappearing.

At the time of Jesus, Palestine had been under Aryan or semi-Aryan influence for more than a thousand years. Nor was this influence entirely from without; for a part of the inhabitants were Aryan, or partly Aryan, in blood. Although the centuries have brought great ethnic changes in this part of western Asia, there long remained ethnic traces of the early Nordic blood, which was supplemented in copious measure by Greek conquests.

I now omit some of the text, because it is merely more history. I begin reading again with the first paragraph on page 146:

Compare the exalted religious ideals of the early Aryans—



By the way, those are the religious ideas to which I have just referred, and I am sure Senators will be in entire agreement with me when I say that some of those very religious ideas now form, in many respects, the basis of the religious principles of the present generation of the white race.

I repeat:

Compare the exalted religious ideals of the early Aryans who conquered India with the repulsive cults of their mix-breed descendants, and what devout Christian will not feel a shudder of the soul when he contemplates the immeasurable and seemingly unbridgeable chasm between the "fair" people who entered India 40 centuries ago and their innumerable mongrel posterity?

Let us quote well-recognized authority which shall serve to heighten our estimate of the culture of the conquerors of the Punjab. "The Aryan tribes of the Veda are acquainted with most of the metals. They have blacksmiths, coppersmiths, and goldsmiths among them, besides carpenters, barbers, and other artisans. They fight from chariots and freely use the horse, though not yet the elephant, in war. They have settled down as husbandmen, till the fields with the plow, and live in villages and towns. They have learned to build 'ships' (river boats) \* \* \* unlike the modern Hindu, the Aryans of the Veda ate beef \* \* \* thus the stout Aryans spread eastward through northern India, pushed on from behind by late arrivals of their own stock, and driving before them, or reducing to bondage, the earlier black-skinned races."

The black-skinned peoples with whom the whites came into contact were so numerous that miscegenation between the Aryan warriors and colored women soon produced a mix-breed element which threatened the purity of the white race. Knowing that race characteristics have not changed during the past 40 centuries, and possibly not materially in a hundred centuries, can we not see that in early India there would be among the whites an element who wished to expel the colored from the districts successively taken, in order to create an environment whereby the Aryan race and culture would be assured permanency? And is it not likely that this element was overruled by others who opposed harsh measures in dealing with the colored, and by another and more powerful element of property owners who profited by labor of the colored and were ready always to resort to force to keep them in serfdom?

I will omit the reading of the next two paragraphs and begin reading with the first full paragraph on page 149, because this paragraph deals principally with the religious aspects, and it is demonstrated, as I have shown in the case of Egypt, and as is being shown here with reference to the Indian history, that degradation of the race became apparent when there was a change in religion.

Religion, that mighty agency in mongrelizing the Caucasian, with its caste-eliminating, race-equalizing tenets, has been seized upon in all lands by the supernatural whites in their efforts to abolish the color line. The "melting pot" in India was not full until there arose a religion attempting to offset the Hindu religion which gave its sanction to caste to preserve the Caucasian. Hinduism taught the colored that caste was founded upon the will of God. Its purpose was to keep the races apart. When the illegitimate mix-breeds in India 25 centuries ago had increased until they were more numerous than the whites, there arose Gautama Buddha, an aristocratic mix-breed with yellow blood predominating, who stripped Hinduism (Brahmanism) of caste and sought a religious reformation that would level the races of India.

We find here an account of the rise of Buddhism, a change of religion from that which existed in India prior to the mongrelization of that great country. The mongrelization started, as I have pointed out, along the same lines, and following the same course that was followed in Egypt and that is being followed in the United States today in Harlem. The only difference between the two is that instead of requiring 12 or 15 centuries to get a mulatto at the head of the government, as was the case with Teharka in Egypt, there might arise and be swept into power in this country, where we have a republican form of government, a great Father Divine, as we have seen in New York, and it may not take more than one century or two centuries for this to come about.

I would not like to see a man with the apparent sacredness, the "divinity" of the great Father Divine, go to Georgia or to Louisiana and there put on a show like that put on in Harlem in New York City when LaGuardia was elected to the mayoralty of the great city of New York.

In just a few minutes I should like to read a passage from the magazine Forum with reference to Mayor LaGuardia to show to what a fever heat this Negro, this so-called divine man, works upon his followers in Harlem.

Historians tell us that those who were at the head of the government in Egypt and in India, that class of people who

at one time made Egypt and India prosperous, warned the white people of those nations against this very thing, just as Jefferson and Lincoln and Douglas and Grant have been warning the American white people.

Listen to this article in the magazine Forum. Of course, I am just sandwiching in this article from the Forum for the present, because I expect to deal with Father Divine a little later and show what a great man he is to the Negroes, and show the Senate how he controlled Harlem through his cult and how he was very strong in other sections of the country.

The title of this article is "Heaven Is in Harlem and a Rolls-Royce the 'Sweet Chariot' of a Little Black God," by Sutherland Denlinger.

I read a quotation preceding the article:

There are thousands of people who call me God—

That is Father Divine talking—

Millions of them. There are millions of them who call me the devil, but I produce God and shake the earth with it.

Father Divine, telling it to a judge.

Remember that is Father Divine, who is head of the cult in Harlem, speaking—Harlem, one of the most thickly populated Negro centers in the world, I believe. I may be wrong in that statement, and if anyone knows to the contrary let me hear from them. I am told—I do not of my own knowledge know—that the politicians of New York let the colored people in Harlem have their own way, in a measure. There is no effort made to stop them from doing these things I am going to read about, such as a man pretending to be God, who so works up the people that they turn their pockets wrong side out and give up all their earthly goods, because Father Divine says, "That is the only way to heaven; give me all you have." I read:

On the evening of November 5, 1933, it had pleased the black god to descend from that "main branch" of "heaven," which is at 20 West One Hundred and Fifteenth Street, Manhattan, and appear, a short, stout, dignified figure, with the wistful eyes of a setter dog, before some 5,000 true believers gathered at the Rockland Palace, Harlem dance hall, to sing his praises. He sat on the stage surrounded by his angels—

Remember, that is Father Divine—

Faithful Mary and Satisfied Love—

Satisfied Love was one of his "angels"—

Wonderful Joy—

Another "angel"—

Sweet Sleep—

Another "angel"—

Good Dreams—

Another "angel"—

and Bouquet—

Another "angel"—

and all the rest of them—and his thick lips parted in a wide smile beneath his scraggly mustache as he watched the voters stowing away his free chicken dinner in the balcony and the folks shouting "He's father! Its wonderful!" on the main floor.

Father Divine heard the chanting—

And that chanting came from the audience, the 5,000 people—

"He's God; he's God; he's God; he's God; he's God."

That is what Father Divine heard as he was being acclaimed by his angels and his children.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I will yield for a question, and I want the Presiding Officer to decide whether it is a question or not. [Laughter.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; I yield for a question only. If it is not a question, I will not yield.

Mr. DAVIS. I should like to know what book the Senator is reading from.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am reading from a periodical, not a book. The periodical is Forum. I am reading from one of

the issues of Forum Magazine, a well-known magazine. If the Senator will bear with me, I shall gladly give the Senator the date of it. It is the Forum of April 1936.

He is God.

All those exclamations "He's God!" that I repeated appear in this article. Those were the cries that came from the multitude of sinners, perhaps, who were before Father Divine. They chanted "He's God; he's God!" to the tune of Marching Through Georgia.

Senators, think of it! Father Divine recalled his boyhood in Georgia, I presume, and so his followers sang, "He's God, he's God, he's God" to the tune of Marching Through Georgia.

And he heard the rhythmic thumping of the big bass drum and the hypnotic blare of trombones and he witnessed fervid enthusiasm of this comparatively small segment of his 2,000,000 followers, and he obviously found it good. He beamed. His almost bald pate, bedewed with perspiration, and at first neither he nor his eager disciples noticed the swarthy, stocky white man with the aggressive chin and the look of a sullen Napoleon who had just then entered the hall. In a way, the presence of this newcomer might have been interpreted as a triumph for the dusky god, for Fiorello H. LaGuardia, standing now in a side aisle, a bewildered look upon his craggy features, was a reformed candidate for mayor of the city of New York, and there had been a time in the development of the deity not too far distant, when the activities of white unbelievers had been directed almost solely toward placing Father in a dungeon cell. But be that as it may, Mr. LaGuardia was able to spend some moments in uninterrupted contemplation of the scene before he was recognized and escorted, past the chicken eaters on the balcony, to a seat upon the tightly packed stage.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. DAVIS. For what purpose has the distinguished Senator from Louisiana given us that religious information? I have been absent from the Chamber. That is why I asked the question.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am sorry that because of pressing business, I presume, the Senator from Pennsylvania was not present when I gave my reason for reading this article at this time. For the Senator's information I will say that I pointed out a while ago how in Egypt and in India the early civilization had religious beliefs almost comparable in many instances to ours of today, but as the black races mixed in with the early white inhabitants of Egypt and of India a mongrel race followed, and when the mongrel race began to become populous and to take charge of the country, those countries, particularly with respect to religion, went back to barbarism, went back to the worship of animals, vegetables, and other objects as their gods, the same as in dark Africa.

My purpose in calling this Harlem situation to the attention of the Senate at the present time is to show that in Harlem, in the city of New York, the most thickly populated Negro section of the country, the Negroes are free to follow almost any religious belief they desire, that some of them have already returned to barbaric conditions insofar as religion is concerned. Imagine a people in America seriously believing that the son of a slave is God! I am trying to show that the same tendency that prevailed in Egypt and in India with relation to religion is present today in this country, in Harlem, where the Negroes go unmolested, as it were, and are permitted to carry on their religion as they desire.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. DAVIS. Will the Senator give me the name of the author of that particular article?

Mr. ELLENDER. I gave it a while ago but will repeat it. The author is Sutherland Denlinger.

Let me read further. I was at the point where Father Divine probably thought that he had a new convert. Of course, I do not believe that LaGuardia came in there for that purpose, but probably Father Divine thought so, anyway, and it made him feel good.

The shouts were heard, "Father, I love you; I love you, I do." The band played it loud and hot, and the brown mass in the great auditorium swayed and sang, "Father, I surrender; Father, I surrender all to you."

This big crowd of 5,000 colored voters were shouting that to Father Divine, who happened to be in the center of the stage at the time.

Father Divine rose suddenly from his seat not far from the man who is now chief executive of the world's greatest city and broke into a well-executed buck and wing. When he subsided, mopping his brow, a colored speaker enlarged upon the dancer's divinity. "Peace, Father!" roared the hall, "it's wonderful!"

Mr. LaGuardia sat patiently. Eventually, amid frenzied applause, god himself took the microphone, to deliver in an odd, squeaky voice a message which (like many purporting to come from on high) was notable more for its ear-filling phrases than for intelligibility. Father took his time, a stenographer took notes, the 5,000 sobbed and cheered. And, when at long last he was through, and it was Mr. LaGuardia's turn, that worthy arose to make probably the strangest speech of his political career.

"Peace, Father Divine," cried the little Latin with the truculent chin, stretching out his arms in a gesture of benediction, "peace be with you all."

This is LaGuardia speaking—

It was the right note. "Peace!" shouted the eager congregation. "Peace, it's wonderful."

"I say," continued Mr. LaGuardia, "I say, Father Divine, no matter what you want, I will support you." [Cheers.]

Cheers followed in the assembly.

I am going to clean up this city, and I came here tonight to ask Father Divine's help and counsel. \* \* \*

That is Mayor LaGuardia talking. Did he believe Father Divine to be divine? Of course not. What he wanted was Father Divine's support and vote. In that connection, I have been contending to the Senate that there are in other sections of the country, centered in the large cities, little groups of Negroes who were able, because of their political strength, to trade their votes in consideration of getting passed by certain States legislation demanding equal social rights with the whites. And here we have LaGuardia, the candidate for the mayoralty of the city of New York, coming to the son of a Negro slave asking for his help. What does he offer him in return for his support?—

Father Divine, no matter what you want, I will support you!

I continue reading from the article:

Strong words—but they were no more successful in winning a political endorsement from the good father than the honeyed syllables which fell a short time later from the lips of Tammany Candidate John Patrick O'Brien, a heavily jowled charmer who once endeared himself to an audience of Greeks by explaining that he quite understood Hellenic culture, having "translated Horace." No; as father, interrupted on election eve while greeting a contingent of the faithful from the Pacific coast, put it, "It's the principle, not the person." And so neither candidate got his support.

This attempt by rival political chieftains to obtain the blessings of father, impressive enough though it was, constitutes only one of many indications that the little black lord of Harlem heaven has become a force to be recognized.

I merely cite this occurrence in Harlem incidentally, in connection with the history of India to which I have referred, and also the Egyptian history, to show that practically the same condition exists in America today, or in certain sections of it, as existed in other eras of early civilizations.

I continue reading from the bottom of page 149 of White America, by Cox:

Religion, that mighty agency in mongrelizing the Caucasian, with its caste-eliminating, race-equalizing tenets, has been seized upon in all lands by the supernatural whites in their efforts to abolish the color line. The "melting pot" in India was not full until there arose a religion attempting to offset the Hindu religion which gave its sanction to caste to preserve the Caucasian. Hinduism taught the colored that caste was founded upon the will of God. Its purpose was to keep the races apart. When the illegitimate mix-breeds in India 25 centuries ago had increased until they were more numerous than the whites, there arose Gautama Buddha, an aristocratic mix-breed with yellow blood predominating, who stripped Hinduism (Brahmanism) of caste and sought a religious reformation that would level the races of India. India was ripe, the colored world was ripe and anxious for such a theory. The success of Buddhism knew no bounds. It was popular. Why not? The teachings of its founder gave to the mongrel a position in human society that evolution had denied him in nature. It bridged an impassable chasm with an assumption.

We leave India, having seen that every social agency of the Aryan devised to preserve race and civilization had failed; and that every social agency observable in the modern Aryan's color



problems was used in India to promote amalgamation, and succeeded. The Aryan conquerors of India utilized every remedial measure but one—they did not attempt geographical separation of races.

That very thing was offered as a solution to our problem by some of our eminent American statesmen. As I stated yesterday, I would be the last person on earth to do anything at this time in order to drive away from our midst the Negroes, by sending them to Liberia, as some profess they desire to do. So far as I am concerned, I do not care to take such steps. What I am interested in is to try to cause the two races to live separately. The time may come when the Negroes will be more numerous than are the whites, but I hope that that time will never come, because, if it does come, as I stated yesterday, we are going to have worse than lynching; we are going to have racial warfare between the whites and the Negroes, and I hope that that will never come about.

What I am praying is that the various States of the Union will stop giving the Negro social equality with the whites, and that the Congress will not give the Negro social equality with the whites, because, if it does—mark what I am telling you, Mr. President—the same warning was given to India, the same warning was given to Egypt, but the warnings went unheeded and their civilizations have perished.

I have about completed, not my speech, but my remarks on the history of India. I contend that the same thing that occurred in India occurred also in Egypt. The first inhabitants of those countries prospered; they were civilized; they progressed in the arts; they progressed in science; they progressed in every way, but just as soon as mongrelization set in, their religion was the first thing to change, and when that happened, then the race went down to decay; they were conquered, and today all we can say about the Egyptians and the Indians is that, despite whatever art and science may still remain, there has been no progress since the mongrelization set in. I repeat, Members of the Senate, what I fear is amalgamation of the white race with the Negro race, which would cause our proud American civilization to sink down to the same depths to which the civilizations of Egypt and of India have deteriorated.

Now, Senators, I am going to bring the question of mongrelization a little nearer home.

Mr. President, the histories to which I have referred dealt with the ancients—people who lived and prospered, I will say to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS], before the coming of Christ. I am now going to bring the matter nearer home. I am going to bring it before the Senate as it affected the civilization of the first landing place of Columbus, the island formerly known as Hispaniola, Santo Domingo, which, as the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] knows, was discovered in 1492.

I have been speaking of the past, of civilizations that prospered and progressed in arts and sciences and medicine and in every other form prior to the coming of Christ. It is now my desire to bring the matter nearer home, and to show the Senate what has happened in the New World—in Haiti.

I am going to start by reading a brief history of Haiti, and then go just a little more into detail of that history. My purpose in giving this brief outline of the history of Haiti, is simply to give you the facts, so that you may have them in your minds, and then have you follow me through a few more detailed pages of Haitian history, to show that the civilization of that island, which at one time was dominated by whites and which at one time was prosperous, decayed, and revolutions set in, because of the inability of the Negro ruler or rulers who succeeded the whites in control, to govern their subjects.

I am sure that every reader in this audience, or a good many of them—perhaps some of them are not quite old enough; I do not know—has read of our occupation of Haiti, which was only in 1911 and 1912, because of the fact that the people of that island were unable to govern themselves, since they were in the hands of a people predominantly Negro. The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] a while ago pointed out the case of Christophe, the famous

emperor of that island; and I invited the Senate and everybody in this audience to read the history of Christophe. It is not long. It is very interesting, and it will bring the point home much better than I can do. Listen to this history, just a few little historical knickknacks that I gathered from Webster's New International Dictionary:

#### HAITI—HISTORICAL OUTLINE

The Republic of Haiti occupies the western third of the West Indian island sometimes called by the Spanish name Santo Domingo, but more often by its native name of Haiti. The island was discovered by Columbus in 1492 and named Hispaniola, or Little Spain; colonization began in 1496, and Haiti developed more rapidly than the other Spanish-American possessions. The desire to exploit the rich soil and gold mines led the Spaniards to establish slavery, and the population rapidly declined. Negro slaves were substituted and became the most numerous element in the population.

Keep that in mind. The Negro slaves became the most numerous element at that time. I ask you to keep that in mind and note what that most numerous element did with the Government of Haiti when control of the country was turned over to them:

In the early part of the seventeenth century pirates took possession of a large part of the territory of Haiti, which was ceded to France in 1607 by the Treaty of Ryswick (Rijswijk). As the settlements expanded and became populous they grew rebellious. When the French Revolution broke out the Negroes and mulattoes were 10 times as numerous as the whites. Conflicts arose between Negroes and mulattoes, and then came a terrible insurrection. In 1793 the allied British and Spaniards sent a force to Haiti. As a counter measure the French Convention issued in the same year a decree of emancipation for all slaves.

In Haiti, as in this country, there was an emancipation of the Negro slaves. France, which at the time I have just read dominated Haiti, was at war with the British. The British and the Spaniards desired to get possession of Haiti; but what did France do? France gave the Haitian people—who, as I have shown, were largely Negroes; there were more Negroes than whites, almost 10 to 1—their freedom, emancipated them, gave them the right to rule that little island. I shall not have time to read the entire history; but Black Majesty, by Vandercook, is a book which I hope everyone in this audience will read. It shows what took place in the Western Hemisphere, right near our doors, since the discovery of America by Columbus. It shows that when the colored race predominated this little island they were unable to govern themselves.

I repeat, that is what I fear here in America. What I intend to show is that if there is no separation of the races, and if the Negroes become in the majority, either as mongrels or not, a decay of our American civilization will inevitably set in.

In 1795 the Spanish colony on the island passed to France. Toussaint L'Ouverture then appeared as leader of the blacks, expelled the British forces, and made himself dictator of the government, which professed nominal submission to France; but in 1801 he demanded independence.

Remember, there was a little island that belonged to France. There was a little island subject to attack. In order to help it, the Government of France said to the people of the island, "All right; we will give you your freedom." Listen to what they did when they obtained their freedom and got control of the government of the island:

In 1802 a French army under Leclerc overthrew the Negroes and captured Toussaint and sent him to France, where he died in captivity. His successor, Dessalines, defeated the French and expelled them in 1803, thus blocking Napoleon's plans for taking over Louisiana.

Dessalines declared himself emperor. When he was assassinated in 1806, Christophe, a full-blooded Negro, succeeded him with the center of his power in the northwest.

That is the ruler to whom the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] referred a while ago.

Petion, another leader, started a temporary republic in the southwest. Boyer succeeded Petion and was able to organize the people of both sections of the island into the Republic of Haiti, but after ruling for 20 years he was overthrown.

In 1844 the eastern and Spanish-speaking districts, comprising about two-thirds of the island, separated from the western part and set up the Dominican Republic. In the western portion, or

Haiti proper, anarchy prevailed. Two years later a republican constitution was proclaimed under President Riche. This did not bring peace or establish order, and the history of Haiti continued to be one of civil war, revolt, and anarchy, during which obligations were incurred to the United States and European powers for damages to their citizens.

In 1911 a joint note was submitted by the United States, Great Britain, France, Germany, and Italy insisting on prompt settlement of claims.

Those were some of the civilized governments which were dealing with this Republic which was under Negro domination; and I shall read to you after a while of the things that some of the emperors and leaders of that Republic did in order to defeat the obligations they had entered into with civilized nations. It was necessary to appoint a commission of the various nations that had dealt with Haiti to force Haiti, which was ruled by Negroes, to meet its just obligations.

I read further:

This precipitated a revolution—

That is, the interference of England, the United States, and other countries—

This precipitated a revolution, which continued intermittently until 1914, when a British cruiser arrived to enforce the overdue claims awarded by arbitration. The Government at Washington thought it time to take action. American marines landed and controlled Cap-Haitien for nearly a month. In July 1915 a reign of terror was inaugurated by President Guillaume Sam, and Rear Admiral Caperton landed marines at Port-au-Prince; since that time the United States forces have controlled the country.

In 1916 a treaty was signed between Haiti and the United States which provides for the establishment of a receivership over Haitian customs under American control. This administration includes not only the distribution of funds for the payment of foreign debts but the expenditure of the balance for domestic purposes. Thus, through the supervision of the finances of Haiti, the United States controls the operations of the Government and has established a protectorate.

Mr. President, this shows what occurred within a stone's throw of this country, in our own hemisphere, since the discovery of America by Columbus. It shows without question of a doubt that the colored people have never been and never will perfect themselves to the extent of giving civilization to a people. I repeat, such a measure as the pending bill is not proposed for the purpose of preventing lynching, but merely to enable the colored people to nudge in a little closer to social equality with the whites. That is what the enactment of the pending bill will lead to, and I repeat, what I said yesterday, that if we pass the pending bill the next thing we will be asked to pass upon will be the repealing of the Jim Crow law throughout the Nation—down in Louisiana and in Georgia and in other Southern States, where we keep the two races separated.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. CONNALLY. Will the Senator in the course of his remarks, if he has not already done so, advert to the experience of the colored man in Liberia and his supposed efforts there to establish a government and a civilization of his own?

Mr. ELLENDER. I would rather not do so at this time.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not wish to urge the Senator to do it at this time if he does not care to.

Mr. ELLENDER. I would rather not go into that detail, because it is my understanding that another Senator will develop that very point at some future time.

Mr. CONNALLY. Some time this month, or next month? [Laughter.]

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not know; perhaps next July. It might be reached by that time. [Laughter.] At any rate, I would rather the Senator would not bring that particular point up at this time, because I made the statement awhile ago, to which I want to adhere, that I do not believe I would support any effort to drive the Negro from this country.

I may change my mind as time goes on, but at present I am going to try to do for the Negro what Thomas Jefferson said it was impossible to do. Thomas Jefferson said that he did not see how the Negroes and the whites could live under the same flag without an amalgamation of the two

races occurring; that they could not live separately. In the South we understand the Negro problem, and we have been able to prevent the Negroes from being on a social equality with the white folks. The Negro in the South, as the Senator from Texas knows, is polite by instinct. He gets that from generations back. But after the Negroes come to the North and rub elbows with the white folks, when they return to the South they get into trouble. They try to associate with the whites down there and, of course, we then resent it.

I shall now read some extracts from a few authors who have made a detailed study of the history of Haiti after it became independent, after the French said to the Haitians, "You folks are slaves down there now; we are afraid that England may take charge of you, and, therefore, we are going to emancipate you." Of course, after the slaves outnumbered the whites in Haiti 10 to 1, they took charge of the Government, and ran it under some of these emperors, some of these kings, who were Negroes, and who tried to rule these people. I want to show exactly how they managed it, how they ruled for themselves, not for the people; not to help the subjects whom they ruled.

France desired to establish in that country a republican form of government, but the people at the head of these military castes were those who desired power, who had become more powerful because of the fact that they were at the head of the army, and who declared themselves emperors; and let us see what happened.

I may not be able to reach that point immediately, but I shall refer to the subject as I read passages from this famous book. I repeat, by the way, I hope every Senator will read *Black Majesty* and see what happened to Haiti under the rule of this black emperor.

I shall now give a concise history of Christophe, who was at one time one of the leaders, the agitators, in Haiti and who became powerful, and because of the force he gained by virtue of the military control he acquired, he got to be emperor. Let us see how he acted. I shall give just a little history.

Henri Christophe, King of Haiti, was born in Granada, West Indies, in 1767, and died October 8, 1820. I will show later how he died. He was an African slave who received his freedom as a reward for faithful service. On the outbreak of the Negro insurrection in 1801 he became one of the leaders, and attracted by his energy and ability Toussaint L'Ouverture conferred upon him a divisional military command.

It will be recalled that this man, Toussaint L'Ouverture, declared himself emperor after the emancipation of the Negro, and after he came to the head of the Government he kicked the French out, and when the French overcame him they brought him back to France and put him in jail, where he died.

After the disposition of Toussaint, Christophe served under his successor and waged a war of intense ferocity against the French, who in 1803 were compelled to evacuate the island. In 1811 Christophe obtained undisputed possession of a portion of the island and was proclaimed Henry I, King of Haiti. His reign was despotic and bloody.

Before I read excerpts from this book, *Black Majesty*, I desire to read a little more in detail the early history of Haiti from another author. The book to which I just referred deals almost exclusively with Christophe, and it gives a picture of his life, what the conditions in Haiti were at the time he became emperor, and how he ruled with pomp and splendor; how he established the famous castle of Sans Souci up on a mountain, and how some of his followers became jealous of his aggrandizement, his climbing so fast. The book shows that within the very walls of the temple he built he reposed after an ignoble death. He was succeeded by another colored militarist who brought Haiti deeper and deeper into the mire, until it was necessary, as I pointed out a while ago, for the civilized countries of the world to take charge of the Haitian Government. Even today we have to send an American citizen to Haiti to supervise the collection



of customs, so that the American Government can be repaid the obligations that were contracted by the Haitian Government with us.

This all conclusively shows that the colored race cannot rule itself, and I hope that Senators will let that fact sink in, and save the day before it is too late; that they will take advantage of the prophecies that were made in Egypt and in India by people who lived in the ancient days, and who foretold what would happen if there were a mongrelization of the white race with the Negro race.

Mr. President, as I stated a while ago, I now desire to read in a little more detail from Haitian history. Before I go into detail in regard to the case of Christophe, I desire to point out to the Senate what happened in Haiti following its independence.

History shows that the Negro race was not entirely to blame for the revolt that took place in Haiti before its independence. Back in 1492, when Columbus discovered the island of Hispaniola, now known as Haiti, the Spaniards wanted gold. They were not interested in colonizing Haiti. They did not desire to civilize the people that were found on that island. What they went there for was gold. They did not go there to develop agriculture. They went there for gold. And, of course, it will be found in the pages of Haitian history that much cruelty was shown the natives by the Spaniards in their mad search for the precious metal.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to submit a request for unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question only. If it is not a question I do not yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana declines to yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I decline to yield. I do not wish to lose the floor.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I desire to propound a question.

Mr. ELLENDER. If it is a question I will agree to yield, but if it is not a question I decline. [Laughter.]

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I desire to inquire whether it would be possible for me to get unanimous consent to make a few remarks, about a minute or two in length, with respect to what I consider to be an unwarranted reflection—

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not know whether it will be possible.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I think the Chair will decide.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not know whether it will be possible for the Senator to get that consent.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Chair will answer that question.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not know whether the Chair can. I think it ought to be left to the Senate itself. I do not care to yield the floor at this time. If the Senator desires to introduce something at a later time, if he will stay here until about 2 o'clock tomorrow morning, he might be able to introduce it, because I think I might be able to stay until 2 a. m., if the Senate will listen to me. [Laughter.]

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have no doubt the Senator can.

Mr. ELLENDER. I refuse to yield, Mr. President, except for a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator state his parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. May I submit this parliamentary inquiry without taking the Senator from Louisiana off the floor?

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not wish to lose the floor. I may say to the Senator from Wyoming that I am not attempting to be discourteous to him, but under a recent ruling I would lose the floor for anything but a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. May I make a parliamentary inquiry without taking the Senator from Louisiana off the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. What is that?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Chair says it is perfectly possible. Then, Mr. President, I desire to know whether I may at this time ask unanimous consent to make a brief statement with respect to what I consider an unintended and unwarranted

reflection upon Mr. E. K. Burlew, of the Interior Department, made upon the floor this morning by the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN], without taking the Senator from Louisiana off the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is not a parliamentary inquiry; but the Chair will state that if the Senator from Louisiana permits the Senator from Wyoming to make such a motion he will be taken off the floor. He will lose the floor if such a question is acted upon.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I now desire to enlighten the Senate, if I may, with respect to early Haitian history. As I was saying a while ago, as long as the white people dominated the civilization of Haiti, matters went pretty well in Haiti. At one time, out of a total population of 600,000, there were something like 40,000 whites, 60,000 mulattoes, and 500,000 slaves, and that was about the relative population, when revolt took place and freedom was given to the Haitians by France. France did not consent to that independence because it wanted to, but France was then under the impression that the British or the Spaniards were going to attempt to take Haiti, and France thought that she would simply give the people of Haiti their freedom to preserve their good will and her own power.

France evidently thought that Haiti might be able to govern itself and offer its own defense against the British and the Spaniards.

The early history of Haiti, before the independence of that island, shows that as long as the black slaves were dominated by the whites, as long as it was in evidence that the whites were superior, so long as they had charge of matters in that country, the slaves remained content and worked for the benefit of all. There was no trouble then. But the moment that emancipation was given to them, the moment that the French Government gave to those people what Abraham Lincoln gave to the Negroes of this country, in that moment the 500,000 colored slaves revolted and took charge of the Government.

I now desire to read to the Senate what developed after independence was given to them, to show how it worked, to prove how despotic the rulers of that island became, and how they returned to African barbarism. That, Senators, is what I fear is going to take place in America if we permit the Negro to become stronger than the whites and attempt to take charge of this Government.

I am not speaking for the generation of the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] nor the generations of Kentucky for 100 years to come, but I am speaking for the future generations of America, and I say that if the Negro is given what the present bill proposes to give him, and what other similar bills now pending will give him, the Negro is going to come here and sit among us, and then behold. He is going to do to this country what he did in Egypt, what he did in India, and what was done in Haiti.

Let me go back to the Haitian history. The title of the book from which I am about to read is Hayti or the Black Republic, by Sir Spenser St. John, K. C. M. G.

I suppose that is an English title. I read from chapter III:

"Que deviendra notre pays quand il sera livré à la vanité et à l'ignorance," exclaimed Bauvais, one of the leaders of the mulatto party. I am afraid this sketch of the history of Haiti since the war of independence will show what are the results to a country when governed by vanity and ignorance.

Having driven out the French by deeds of unquestioned valor and energy, and with a cruelty which the infamous conduct of Rochambeau could palliate, if not justify, the Haitians determined to throw off all allegiance to France and establish an independent government.

At Gonaives, on the 1st of January 1804, General Dessalines assembled all his military chiefs—

Dessalines, as I stated a while ago, was a Negro who gained quite a reputation as a lover of his race in that island and became strong, so much so that after the French yoke was broken he became emperor—

Dessalines assembled all his military chiefs around him and had read to them the Act of Independence, which terminated with the words, "forever to renounce France, and to die rather than live under her dominion."

In a proclamation, Dessalines was careful to declare that it was not their mission to disturb the tranquillity of neighboring islands, but in unmistakable language he called upon them to put to death every Frenchman who remained in the island.

That is what this emperor desired to do with the Frenchmen, the benefactors of his people, who gave them independence, who emancipated them. He put them out or killed them.

This was followed by a declaration signed by the chief generals choosing Dessalines as Governor-General of Haiti for life, with power to name his successor, and to make peace or war. He was thus vested with arbitrary power, and proceeded to exercise it.

His first act was the one on which his fame rests, and which endears his memory to the Haitians. He in fact decreed that all the French who were convicted or suspected of having connived the acts of the expelled army, with the exception of certain classes, as priests and doctors, should be massacred.

That is what that brute did to his benefactors. This applied not only to those suspected of guilt but to all their wives and children.

Fearing that some of his generals, from interest or sympathy, might not fully carry out his decree, he made a personal tournée through the different departments—

I suppose "tournée" means a tour.

and pitilessly massacred every French man, woman, or child that fell his prey.

One can imagine the saturnalia of these liberated slaves enjoying the luxury of shedding the blood of those in whose presence they had formerly trembled, and that without danger of reprisal. What resistance could these helpless men, women, and children offer to their savage executioners? Even now one cannot read unmoved the record of those days of horror.

These horrors remind me, Senators, of the condition that existed in my own State soon after the Civil War, during the reconstruction period when Federal Negro soldiers were sent down into the city of New Orleans to take charge of the affairs of that city. History shows that those Negro soldiers, in the presence of each other and in the presence of the mothers, seized young girls and debauched them. That is why the South rose en masse and would not tolerate Negro domination; that is what caused the trouble, the bitterness, and the hatred down South during reconstruction days, when the strong arm of the Federal Government reached into the South and said to us, "You white folks down there cannot govern yourselves; we will let the Negro be in politics and govern the Southern States."

I do not want to bare those wounds; they are now closed; the scars have been almost effaced. Let us take care not to do anything that will reopen them. Let not the strong arm of the Federal Government extend into Louisiana, Georgia, Mississippi, Alabama, and other Southern States, and infer, "You cannot govern yourselves; the Federal Government must go down and show you and teach you how you are to handle the Negro problem." We are doing a good job, Senators, and we propose to do the job ourselves, in our own way, as we have been doing it in the past.

I continue the reading:

Dessalines, like most of those who surrounded him, was in every way corrupt; he is said to have spared no man in his anger or woman in his lust. He was avaricious, but at the same time he permitted his friends to share in the public income by every illicit means. His government was indeed so corrupt that even the native historians allow that the administration was distinguished "for plunder, theft, cheating, and smuggling."

Imagine the head of a government being guilty of such crimes.

Dessalines, when he appointed an employee, used to say—

Listen to this, if you can understand it:

Plumez la poule, mais prenez garde qu'elle ne crie.

That happens to be French. I am not much of a French scholar but I will translate it. I will reread it in the language in which it appears:

Plumez la poule, mais prenez garde qu'elle ne crie.

The English translation is, "Pluck the chicken, but mind you that it does not squawk."

That was his doctrine: "Take all you can; go to the home of any citizen and plunder all his belongings, but do not

make any noise about it. Steal from them; I will keep my ears closed." That was the doctrine preached by the head of that nation's government, who happened to be a colored man. I will not entertain the spectacle of such a condition in this country. Of course, as I have said many times, it will never come in my lifetime; it will never come in the lifetime of my children's children's children; but I am prophesying for future generations. I hope that America will realize the seriousness of the situation before it becomes too late.

The tyranny exercised by Dessalines and his generals on all classes made even the former slaves feel that they had changed for the worse. There were no courts to mitigate the cruelty of the hard taskmasters, who, on the slightest pretext, would order a man or woman to be beaten to death.

This, Mr. President, was in Haiti, within a stone's throw of our country. I am reading the history of what occurred not 4,000 years before Christ but just a little more than a century ago. That condition prevailed in our own Western Hemisphere because of the fact that the rulers of that island were of the colored race who had superseded the whites who were not predominant. So long as the whites predominated there was order.

I am just wondering what would have happened to the South if the Negroes there had simply been turned loose and the great Federal Government here in Washington had attempted to keep order by the same method that prevailed during reconstruction days. I ponder what would have happened to the American Nation under similar circumstances. Just as surely as I am talking to you, with more colored in some States down there than white, and in many States almost as many, if the South had been dominated by the Negroes, that in itself would have sooner or later caused this Government to have sunk to the depths of India, of Egypt, of Haiti, and other countries in like conditions. It is fortunate that the white South revolted in reconstruction days and took charge of its government, for white supremacy prevailed. It is fortunate not only for the South but for the North; in fact, for this fair country of ours as a whole.

In the month of August 1804 news arrived that Bonaparte had raised himself to the imperial throne of France. Dessalines determined not to be outdone, and immediately had himself crowned emperor. His generals were eager that a nobility should be created; but he answered, "I am the only noble in Haiti." As the eastern portion of the island was still occupied by the French, he determined to drive them out; but he was unable to take the city of Santo Domingo, and retired again to the west.

In June 1805 he published a constitution, which was framed without consulting his generals, and created discontent among them. A conspiracy was organized, arising in the south, followed a visit from Dessalines, where he had given full scope to his brutality; and the insurgents marched forward and seized Port-au-Prince. When the emperor heard of this movement, he hastened to the capital, but fell into an ambush, and was shot at Port Rouge, about half a mile from the city.

The only good quality that Dessalines possessed was a sort of brute courage; in all else he was but an African savage, distinguished even among his countrymen for his superior ferocity and perfidy.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. This morning the Senator stated that when he started reading a book that would mean filibustering had started. Is that correct now?

Mr. ELLENDER. No. I am going to repeat what I said this morning. So far as I am personally concerned—and I mean this sincerely—this filibuster has not started, because I am not now filibustering. Although I have been on this floor 5 days, I am not filibustering. I am still trying to prove my case as I see this question. I have developed a line of thought which I have been trying to follow through, and that line of thought is to show that conditions which have existed in other countries may affect this country in course of time should equality of races be allowed.

I will say further that I may filibuster on this bill; I may get off the subject; but so far as I am personally concerned I am going to talk here until the breath is out of my body before the pending bill passes the Senate.



Furthermore, I am not going to stand before the Senate and prevent the passage of any legislation desired by the President. I am willing to have the pending bill set aside for that purpose, so far as I am personally concerned; I do not want this bill in any manner to prevent the passage of any other legislation. If the leaders on the other side of the question desire, so far as I am concerned—I am talking now only for ALLEN ELLENDER, the junior Senator from Louisiana; I am not speaking for the other Senators—I repeat I am willing at any time to have the pending bill set aside so as to allow any other legislation to come in and be considered, and then come back and debate this bill, if we must; but I will say to the proponents of this bill that I will stay here until Christmas after next before it shall pass the Senate.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question only.

Mr. TYDINGS. Is the Senator reading from Black Majesty?

Mr. ELLENDER. No, sir.

Mr. TYDINGS. What is the book from which he is reading? Is it a history of Haiti?

Mr. ELLENDER. It is a history of Haiti by a famous Englishman. Black Majesty is more in the nature of a novel.

Mr. TYDINGS. Who is the author of the book from which the Senator is reading?

Mr. ELLENDER. The author is Sir Spenser St. John, K. C. M. G., which means, I presume, that he is a great writer.

Mr. LODGE. It means "Knight Commander of the Order of St. Michael and St. George."

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts for his contribution. Continuing reading from this volume:

He was incapable as an administrator and treated the public revenue as his own private income. He had concubines in every city, who were entitled to draw on the treasury to meet their extravagance; in fact, the native historians are in truth utterly ashamed of the conduct and civil administration of their national hero.

The death of Dessalines proved the signal of a long civil war. A national assembly met at Port-au-Prince, voted a constitution prepared by General Petion, by which the power of the chief of the state was reduced to a minimum, and then elected Christophe.

Christophe is the emperor to whom I referred a while ago, and about whom the book on my desk is written; it is very interesting, and I repeat that I hope the Senator from Washington [Mr. SCHWELLENBACH] will read the book, not for his enlightenment, but just for pastime.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. The Senator intends to read that book, too; does he?

Mr. ELLENDER. I have read it a dozen times.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. I mean, here, so that we may listen to it.

Mr. ELLENDER. I may read it at some time in the future. I do not know yet, but I may; perhaps not at this sitting, but a little later on—in July or August, when the weather is warm. [Laughter.]

He in some respects was another Dessalines, and resented this effort to restrain his authority. He marched on the capital of the west with 12,000 men, but after various combats failed to capture the city; then retired to Cap-Haitien, and there had a constitution voted which proclaimed him President of Haiti.

The senate again met in Port-au-Prince in 1806 to elect a President, and their choice fell on Petion, who, of all the influential men in the west and south, certainly appeared the most deserving. He had scarcely been installed, when his generals began to conspire against him, and the war with Christophe absorbed most of the resources of the country. No event, however, of any great importance occurred till the year 1810, when Rigaud, having escaped from France, arrived in Haiti, and was received with much enthusiasm. Petion apparently shared this feeling for his old chief, and imprudently gave him the command of the southern department. Rigaud was too vain to remain under the authority of Petion, his former subordinate, and therefore separated the south from the west. The President would not

attempt to prevent this by war, and accepted the situation, so that the island was divided into five states—Christophe in the north, the old Spanish colony in the east, Petion in the west, Rigaud in the south, and Goman, a petty African chief, in the extreme west of the southern department.

Christophe in 1811 proclaimed himself king and created a nobility.

Rigaud died, and soon after the south rejoined the west, which was menaced by a new invasion from the north. In 1812 Christophe's army advanced to besiege Port-au-Prince; but finding their attacks frustrated, the soldiers, weary of the war, began to desert to Petion, and had not the King hastened to raise the siege, it is probable his army would have gone over to the enemy.

King Henry I, as he was called, appears then to have abandoned himself to his savage temper, and his cruelties might be compared to those of Dessalines, and prepared the way for that union of the whole island which followed. Petion, though rather an incapable ruler, was not cruel, and attached the people to his government.

In 1814, the fall of Napoleon brought about peace in Europe, and the French Government hastened to send agents to Haiti to claim submission to the mother country. Petion refused, whilst offering an indemnity to the colonists; but Christophe, having secured the secret instructions of the French agent, did not hesitate to execute them. These proceedings of the French made the rival chiefs forget their own dissensions and prepare to receive another French expedition. Orders were given that on its appearance off the coast every town and village should be burnt down, and that the inhabitants should retire to the mountains. The old planters were urging their Government to destroy all the inhabitants of Haiti and repeople it from Africa; but a discovery of their projects produced so great an effect in England, that public opinion forced the Congress of Vienna to declare that the slave-trade was forever abolished.

In 1816 Petion named a commission to revise the constitution; the principal alterations were to elect a President for life and to add to the Senate a Chamber of Deputies. Petion, however, did not long enjoy his new dignity; he died in 1818, at the early age of 48, it is said of fever, but the opinion is still prevalent in Haiti that he died of weariness of life, brought on by the loss of all his illusions and the constant public and private annoyances to which he was subject. During his illness he is said to have refused all restoratives, and even to have rejected food. Petion, though not a great man, sincerely loved his country, and devoted his energies to govern it well; but he was feeble in his measures, and from love of popularity allowed every kind of abuse to flourish in the financial administration. M. Robin, however, says truly that he was "the most popular and humane chief that Haiti ever possessed."

Boyer, through the energetic intervention of the military, was unanimously chosen by the Senate President of the Republic, and commenced his long career as chief of the state in March 1818. Though he committed many faults, he appears to have been the most energetic and honest of the series of Haitian rulers. His first care was to establish order in the finances; and if his only errors were not to have erected a statue to his predecessor or founded a hospital for beggars, with which M. Robin appears to reproach him, his friends may still be permitted to admire him. Fortune, or rather his energy, everywhere favored him. In 1819 he put down the long-neglected insurrection of Goman in the far west, and then prepared to move against King Henry, whose savage rule had alienated the affection even of his own guards. Struck down by apoplexy, the chief of the northern department was deserted by all, and sought refuge from anticipated indignities in suicide.

The north was almost unanimously determined to rejoin the rest of the Republic, and Boyer marched on Cap-Haitien, to be received there with enthusiasm as the first president of United Haiti.

Christophe was no doubt a very remarkable man, with indomitable energy, who saw the necessity of developing his country, but whose despotic nature cared not for the means, so that the end was attained.

Christophe, as I have stated, was the ruler, and was formerly a Negro slave. He was all right, so some historians say, but for his despotic nature, and he cared not for the means employed, so that the end was attained.

In spite of many admitted atrocities, however, there is no doubt he acquired a marked ascendancy over the minds of the people, which even to this day is not completely lost. Discussions still continue as to the rival systems of Petion and Christophe, but if, to secure the greatest happiness to the greatest number be the object of government, the *laissez-faire* system of the former was more suited to Haytian nature than the severity of the latter. As far as material prosperity was concerned, there was no comparison between the two departments, though the productiveness of the north was founded on the liberal application of the stick. On many of the large estates, a certain number of lashes was served out every morning as regularly as the rations.

Boyer's fortune continued. In 1822 Santo Domingo separated from Spain and placed herself under the command of the President of Hayti, who was welcomed in the Dominican capital with every demonstration of joy.

Mr. President and Members of the Senate, there is quite a bit more of this history of Haiti, which deals particularly with the country after it became independent. It is not my desire at this time to read the rest of this history, nor shall I ask, because of its length, that it be included with my remarks—I do not want to burden the Record—but, seriously, I invite the attention of Senators to the book, and urge them to read it, and be convinced of what I am trying to lay before them: That the colored race, if permitted to take charge of affairs, is not equal to the occasion. Let us attempt, as I have said on several occasions, to deal fairly with the members of that race, as we have done in the South; sympathetically and kindly, and above all, understandingly.

There may be in the South, as there may be in the North, a number of white men with black hearts; I mean by that, cruel men who may have done wrong to the Negroes, just as the early Spaniards did wrong to the inhabitants of Haiti when they took possession of that island, in their attempt to secure its gold and other riches. I want to say, however, that the good people of the South, the thinking people, the people as a whole, are very sympathetic with the Negro. We have been considerate of the Negro all of our lives. As a matter of fact, we consider the Negroes our wards. They are a great economic asset to us down South. We treat them kindly; and when I say that, I mean the larger portion of the white race do. I believe, and in fact I know, that the Negro of the South loves the white people of the South; he always has, and in most cases he is obedient to the whites' wishes.

Read the history of the Civil War, and you will find that notwithstanding the fact that many of the slaves obtained their freedom, they still remained with their former masters. I can give you a personal experience. My grandfather, the late Thomas Ellender, owned slaves. A kinder man never lived. Because of his sympathetic understanding and just treatment to his Negro slaves, I want to say, that they never left his farm. It was only 2 years ago that one of those slaves died on my father's plantation.

This Negro's name was Henry Simmons. He came to our plantation as a slave, he remained there, he raised his family there, he died there, and today on that very place is his son, Rodney. I love Rodney Simmons. He is a colored man, but I love him. We have been kind to him and he to us.

I will never forget "Aunt Clara." We call the old colored people "Uncle So-and-So" or "Aunt So-and-So." "Aunt Clara," the wife of "Uncle Henry," was kind to me, and I will never forget her. I loved her. In the morning I would sneak away from my home, when I was but 4 or 5 years old, and sometimes my mother would not know where I was. "Aunt Clara" lived in a cabin in the servants' quarters and I would go over to "Aunt Clara's" and get from her some of the big biscuits she used to make, and which I liked. I liked "Aunt Clara" a lot.

The colored man of the South has the respect of the white men. He has never tried to rub elbows with him. The only time the colored man ever becomes obnoxious to the whites is when he goes up in the North and meets with some of the white folks, who instill discontent in his mind, and, lacking in good judgment, he is influenced. It is because the northern whites permit them to rub elbows that they develop impertinence.

When the colored man comes back home and tries the same conduct, we do not stand for it down there and he soon realizes it. We feel kindly toward the colored people of the South, we like them, we are sympathetic with their troubles, and many of them have I myself fed and cared for, paid their doctor bills, and acted as their attorney when they needed one; helped them out in every way possible, and I have never refused them assistance. That is the true feeling of Southerners for the colored people in the South and I am confident that the same sympathetic feeling does not prevail between the Negroes of the North and the white people of the North, a statement I make without fear of contradiction, because, notwithstanding the fact, as I have pointed out in the last 3 or 4 days, that the Constitution of the United States guarantees to the Negro race equal rights

under the thirteenth and fourteenth amendments, some legislatures have seen fit to pass the statutes I have read drawing the color line closer and closer, because they have been forced to follow such procedure.

Why was that? It was because when the Negro first attempted to rub elbows with the whites up here they were repulsed, and that is why these little groups of Negroes, when they became a little powerful, when they were given the ballot, had these statutes enacted into the law to enforce their demands upon the white people. I can just imagine someone in these little cliques saying, "This restaurant man on Fifth Avenue says I can't go in his hotel to eat. I am going to show him. I'll get our society together, and we'll get a law passed, so he won't dare refuse me again."

It was because some of these Negroes were refused burial in the same cemeteries with the whites and were prevented from going into the same hotels and dining in the same restaurants, as the northern people certainly must have refused them, that the statutes were passed. Otherwise they never would have been put on the statute books.

Nothing like these statutes is found in the South, because I do not believe the Negroes have ever tried to go into the various restaurants there, and if they did, they soon realized that they had a new lesson to learn. The South will never surrender its white supremacy.

Mr. President, I have covered the Haitian history only in a limited way, and, as I have just said, I hope that Senators will read the rest of the chapter from which I have been reading. It is not only interesting, but it brings the point home to us. It makes it clear that what happened in India and what happened in Egypt and what happened in Haiti may happen in this country, if certain conditions are not checked.

I have spoken of Christophe, and I shall read just a few passages from the book I hold in my hand, and I entertain the hope that Senators will read the whole of the book, because it contains very interesting reading matter, and it makes the point clearer than I would ever be able to make it, and leads inescapably to the conclusion of which I have spoken.

The long southern peninsula of Haiti, a narrow procession of steep, unfertile mountains, divided by a hundred precipices from natural intercourse with the rest of the country, had always been a center of rebellion. The old affranchi class was strongest there. In that region the prosperous mulatto planters had never accepted the blacks as their political or social equals. They scorned ignorant, fiery Dessalines and hated him for one of the few laws he had dictated—that all subjects of his empire should be known as "blacks."

This outlawed more than a hundred words that had come into use to describe various shades of color and mixtures of blood. It had all been worked out with elaborate care. A man who could prove his veins bore 228 parts white blood to 94 parts Negro felt himself the social superior of another who was known to be afflicted with 84 parts Negro blood to only 112 parts white. And Jean Jacques, the clown of the minuet, had laughed at their little dignities! It was a thing not to be forgiven even an emperor and a conqueror. The very governors and generals he had appointed, who had risen to power under his protection and owed their authority to the luster of his name, began to rise against him. The mulattoes in all parts of the empire joined with them. Murmurs of restlessness and gusts of laughter grew to active civil war.

The southern peninsula fell to the rebels. Word came to Emperor Jean Jacques, but he angrily dismissed the messengers. More of their tedious papers.

They were marching on Port-au-Prince. The capital was doomed to fall at any hour, they told him. Emperor Jean Jacques could not understand. They brought him news of a rebellion, but no mention of battles, of charges, repulses, and death. Was no one resisting, or had all the world gone mad? Suddenly Jean Jacques began to roar with the raging fury that had defeated France. The sneaking yellow men had betrayed him. He'd make all right and orderly with a few swift saber strokes. He had but to ride proudly in his finest uniform before his people and they would remember who was master.

He mounted his horse, gathered his personal staff about him, and started for Port-au-Prince.

I have read this particular passage merely to show that even among the Negro race itself there was Christophe, who was trying to rule, and, as this little history from which I read shows, he tried to govern wisely. He was not educated, but he attempted to rule to the best of his ability.



I think history will bear out that statement. He entrusted certain details to the judgment of his generals, to the consideration of people with whom he dealt. Instead of trying to help him to make of Haiti a proud country in which to live, to make it prosperous, to make it progress, they failed miserably. The savage instinct from Africa, the lust, was stronger in them than the idea of trying to advance; and let me read what fate befell the man who had fed them, who was their emperor.

It may be that Christophe was unwise in trying to establish upon a mountain, a citadel of such elaborateness, a fortress of such stupendous grandeur, that it threatened to impoverish his subjects. It may be that his subjects had the right to revolt because of all the money that was being spent by the emperor for his obsession and for the convenience of his white wife in the citadel. He might have gone too far, and that may be the reason why some of these leaders in Haiti turned against him and caused his death in his own castle, as I will read from the last few pages of this book. Although an effort was being made to establish in Haiti a republican form of government for the good of the people living in that island, yet notwithstanding the fact that here was one of their leaders who was probably abler than anyone else in the island to put that proposition over, he could not find among his followers men he could trust. Can we imagine such a thing happening in this country? I ask the question.

I now read from chapter 16, page 190:

Among the underservants at Sans Souci was an old black man, born in Africa, who professed to be a witch doctor. He had first come to Milot in chains to be tried by the king for the offense of practicing his trade without proper regard for the kingdom's laws "governing the medical profession." But Christophe had acquitted him and he had stayed on at the palace.

At daybreak this man was brought to the king's bed chamber. For 2 hours the witch doctor, aided by a valet, massaged Henry's body with a mixture of red pepper and raw rum, a liniment held in great esteem in the old slave days. At 9 o'clock they dressed him in his most splendid blue-and-white-and-gold uniform, and at 10 his four bodyguards propped him in a throne-like chair and carried him down the stairs and out onto the main terrace at the palace's western end.

Below, filling the narrow valley of Milot and stretching away into the humid distance, were the assembled regiments of the Army of Haiti, their rich and vivid uniforms glinting brightly in the morning sun. Certain companies were missing, but it was a lack no one spoke of.

Every eye was turned toward the palace. Half the Army saw the king's chair being carried to its place on the terrace. Five thousand blacks could hear Christophe's booming, roaring voice break the silence:

"Bring me my horse," he called.

It was the first sound he had uttered that day.

The white horse, fully caparisoned, was waiting behind a wall. In a complete and breathless quiet a groom led it across the terrace toward Henry's throne.

At sight of it a vast shouting smashed the silence. With a single voice the Army cheered, "Vive le Roi! Vive l'homme Christophe!"

That is French. "Vive le Roi" means "long live the king." "Vive l'homme Christophe" means "long live the man Christophe."

Down the valley thousands of hats were flung into the air. The hoarse, gigantic shouting beat against the mountains and rolled back in thundering echoes. Drummers in ranks pounded wildly, fiercely, on their drums.

The horse came to a stand 10 feet from the throne. The four bodyguards turned toward the King. He shook his head and swept them away with his arm. He twitched off the robe that covered his lap.

Dr. Stewart, standing in the crowd, pulled at his clean-shaven chin and stared.

Christophe looked straight before him. He breathed deep. The cheering suddenly ceased while the echoes faded down the valley. Christophe stood erect. In five powerful, headlong strides he reached the white horse. One hand went to its mane, the other to the saddle. He bent a little to leap up. But while the court and army looked on, King Christophe slowly, slowly, like an empty bag, slumped down till he lay under the horse's feet with his arms outstretched and his face against the earth. The strength so miraculously summoned for the instant had gone out of him.

Rain had fallen during the night. When Stewart, the Queen, little Vastey, and Dupuy picked him up, his uniform was smeared with mud. Dry sobs were shaking him.

When they set him back in the throne the soldiers below cheered again, but this time the sound was scattered and half-hearted. The Queen bit her lips. The gaping courtiers nearby noted with astonishment that sour, silent Dr. Stewart, was smiling

with a queer proud smile and that tears ran unashamed down his furrowed cheeks.

The King gave an order. A page ran down the stairs to where the first company of soldiers stood by the singing fountain that fell over the bright blue wall.

The parade began.

As each platoon passed the throne where Christophe sat the men broke into spontaneous cheers: "Vive le Roi! Vice l'homme Christophe!"

A little beyond him a clerk sat at a table and gave each man as he passed a gift from the King of four gourdes of money.

Then, because they had reached the far end of the west terrace, the line of marching men turned around a high garden wall that hid Christophe from their sight.

The review lasted several hours. Christophe sat upright and kept his right hand rigidly in salute. But when a third of the procession had passed him, two sorts of cheering sounded faintly in the valley.

As the soldiers passed before him they called, "Vive l'homme Christophe"; as they passed around the corner of the wall out of sight of him, they broke ranks, and, all unconscious of the contrast, shouted, "A bas le Roi! Vive l'indépendance!"

"Down with the king. Give us independence."

Each company had been touched by the revolution. Duke Richard and the generals associated with him had given word that there was to be no more work, that the Kingdom would become part of the republic, and that all men at last were to be gloriously free. "The tyranny is ended," was the cry.

They had come to the review drawn by a lingering dread and a lingering love for their King. But the master had crumpled into the mud, and though, when his eyes were on them, they cheered and stayed in stiff parade, once out of his sight they were quit of him.

At last the tail of the procession, still meek but not cheering, passed and Christophe turned his head to find that the nobles, the generals, the servants, the gentlemen, and ladies in waiting who had stood behind his throne in the morning, had quietly slipped away. Except for a few who stood close to him he was alone.

Remember, I am reading now about King Christophe, and my purpose in doing so is to show how frequently revolutions took place in such countries. The people were incapable of ruling, and the moment one of their own race tried to govern, as this man tried, revolution started, jealousies grew up, and, of course, a new government was created. The conditions on that island were such as to make its people live in fear at all times. There was no real government.

The valet and the witch doctor; elderly, wise Prevost, Count of Limonade and Secretary of State; Dupuy; Baron Vastey; three old, erect black generals; the Scotch physician; the fat Prince Royal Victor-Henry; the young Negro Princesses, Athenaire and Amethiste; and Marie-Louise, his beloved, gentle, simple Queen, were there beside him. A stone's throw away was the Palace of Sans Souci—queerly named—its doorways empty and its leaded windows swinging wide. Evidently the last of its servants and sentries had gone away.

The King lifted his hands helplessly to them and they carried him through the echoing, silent palace up to his balcony.

They brought him his battered brass telescope. He sent one of the generals down the royal road to find out the progress of the rebellion and bring the report back.

Athenaire and Amethiste, his daughters, one 20 and the other 22, sat on the ground and laid their cheeks against his knees. He sent the others away.

He saw the solitary general, who somewhere had found a rich, brocade banner, ride proudly down the wide road toward Cap Henry. The old man went as if a great army followed close behind him. Two hours later, in the twilight he came back. A rebel sniper had shot off his cocked hat and he had lost his banner. He was still alone.

Christophe sent his daughters away and asked for Dr. Stewart. The sun sank below the far-away rim of the sea and the night rose swiftly up the hills. Soon the valley of Milot was dark and murmurous. The sunlight touched the mountain peaks and then was gone.

The Scotch doctor sat on a stiff chair beside the King. They had been friends so long, talk was superfluous.

Once Henry whispered: "Toussaint, the Tiger and I . . . We dreamed so much and we have done so little."

Again, with a certain rich pride in his tone, he said: "To be great, Duncan, is to be lonely. To be magnificent is to have men hate you."

The sky was red with the reflection of flames. The King's chateaux in the Plaine du Nord were on fire. Through the brass telescope one could see little dancing shadows pass before the pyres of flames. Now and then an isolated shot, a sound of distant cheering, and a brief mad rumble on a tom-tom drum came up to them. Christophe cleared his throat.

"Duncan, they will be here soon now. You must go. There are still horses in the stables, I think. Take whatever you can find that's worth anything, then go by back trails to the Cap. You will be safe with the English consul. Good-bye."

"Henry," said Dr. Stewart, "don't be a God-damned fool." He stood up. "I am going to send Marie-Louise and the children to you, but I will be over the hall if you want me."

They shook hands.

The Queen and the King's three children came to him. He then sent for Vastey and Dupuy. He said good-bye to them all; gave, in something of his old tone of command, orders that the two men were to take his family at once to Cap Henry and put them under the protection of English friends there. He gave Marie-Louise the papers that entitled her to the fortune Sir Home Popham had deposited in the Bank of England for her. Then he kissed them and sent them away.

When they had gone he called his valet and asked him to bring a bowl of water.

While the man stood by he slowly washed his hands and dried them on a damask napkin. Then he sent the man away.

But the servant stayed outside the door of the King's bed-chamber and watched through the keyhole.

He saw Christophe, after a long, quiet minute, throw himself off his chair and with clutching fingers drag himself across the room to a closet. He saw him reach up and turn the knob, saw him pull down a snow-white satin gown, roll himself into it, and then, like some stricken animal, drag himself horribly across the floor to his bed and lift himself onto it.

From where he lay Christophe could look down the valley. It was not empty now. It was filled with a shouting, running mob of men carrying torches.

The King took something from a little cabinet by his bedside. While the trembling valet still peered hypnotized through the keyhole watching him, he fell back and lay still. A tall clock in the corridor ticked regularly.

Running feet sounded on the stairways. The first of the looting rebels were already in the palace.

A great crash of broken glass was heard.

"They are breaking even the mirrors that have imaged me," said the King aloud, and his voice was broken.

He clenched his right fist and raised his left hand, which held a pistol to his temple.

A shot reverberated, followed by sudden quiet. The King was dead. He had put a golden bullet, molded long ago, through his brain.

Mr. President, the reading of this little passage simply shows the extent of the barbaric savagery that was in the hearts of those people around Christophe, the king who fed them, and who tried to take care of them.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator for a question.

Mr. CONNALLY. Since the hour of 5 o'clock has arrived, I inquire whether the Senator has concluded his remarks, or whether he would prefer to go on tomorrow; and if unanimous consent could be secured for that purpose, whether that would be agreeable to the Senator.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, let me say that I am very serious and in earnest about the question I am now discussing. Yesterday and today I have tried, to the best of my ability, to show what happened in foreign countries long before the birth of Christ. For the past hour I have been trying to bring the matter a little nearer home—as it affects Haiti, and to show what happened in Haiti when Haiti had a colored ruler. I have now reached the point where I expect, if I may be permitted—it will not take me long—to bring this matter home to America; to show that the same practices with reference to religion that prevailed in Egypt and in India are being carried on right here in this country, and that under such an influence the Negro is prone to revert to barbaric acts.

Mr. President, personally I can go on a little longer. I may be able to get through this afternoon or this evening; but if I am permitted to resume and conclude my remarks tomorrow, it will not take me long, as I have said, and I should like to complete them tomorrow so as to have my entire speech in consecutive order. I therefore ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to continue my remarks tomorrow.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I desire to make an inquiry of the Senator. He said it would not take him long to conclude his remarks. Will he state about how long he expects to speak?

Mr. ELLENDER. I will say to the Senator from Kentucky that I am quite confident that I can conclude what I want to say in about 2 hours, or two hours and a half; not much

longer. If unanimous consent to that effect can be obtained, provided I do not lose the floor, I will yield now for a recess.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to make a statement in connection with my reservation of an objection.

It is useless to try to enforce the rules against more than two speeches by the same Senator on a single legislative day, if at the end of each day unanimous consent is to be given that the speaker who has not concluded at that time shall go on the next day, because under the rule he loses the floor. While the Chair might recognize him the next day if it were his second speech, the Chair could not recognize him the next day if it were his third speech, which would be the case now with the Senator from Louisiana.

I am not going to object to the Senator's request, but I desire to serve notice that my action is not to be regarded as a precedent. I am not thereby bound to consent hereafter to any other Senator being recognized by unanimous consent in violation of the rules, which, of course, can always be abrogated by unanimous consent and anything permitted. We might as well understand, however, that we are in the middle of a filibuster; and if any effort is to be made to bring this matter to a conclusion, those who are indulging in the filibuster need not expect those of us who have to sit here from day to day, and by our presence give ear to all that is said pertaining to this bill, to waive the rules which might in some imaginary case be expected to begin to commence to start to bring this debate to a conclusion.

With that understanding, I shall not object at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator from Louisiana will be permitted to conclude his remarks tomorrow.

#### LOCAL OPTION TERRITORY IN 1937

[Mr. SHEPPARD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement entitled "Local Option Territory in 1937," which appears in the Appendix.]

#### PREVENTION OF AND PUNISHMENT FOR LYNCHING

[Mr. McKELLAR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from R. E. Folk, of Nashville, Tenn., relative to the pending bill, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### PUNISHMENT OF ROBBERY IN THE DISTRICT

Mr. BARKLEY obtained the floor.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. BILBO. Today I introduced a bill affecting the laws of the District of Columbia, in the hope that the enactment of the bill would put a stop to the wave of crime which seems to have besieged the Nation's Capital.

I observe in the afternoon newspapers a report from the police department. Three hold-ups, in which colored bandits collected loot to the amount of \$243, together with 11 housebreakings, 9 thefts from parked automobiles, 3 purse snatchings, 2 pocket pickings, and 4 bicycle thefts were reported to the police during the 24 hours ending at 8 o'clock a. m. today. Maj. Ernest Brown, superintendent of police, said these reports did not indicate an unusual amount of crime in the city.

If that statement is true, I think the bill which I have introduced, if enacted, will help Major Brown and the police force of this city to give us some semblance of law and order in the District of Columbia. I ask at this time unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The bill (S. 3282) to amend the law with respect to robbery in the District of Columbia, to provide that such crime may be punished as a capital offense, is as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That section 810 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of laws for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 810. Whoever shall feloniously take or attempt to take anything of value from the person or the immediate actual possession of another against his will by force, by violence to his



person, or by putting such person in fear of immediate injury to his person by the exhibition of a deadly weapon, shall be guilty of robbery, and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by death if the penalty is so fixed by the jury, and if the jury fails to fix the penalty at death, shall be imprisoned for any term of not less than 10 years which may be fixed by the court."

SEC. 2. Section 811 of such act of March 3, 1901, as amended, is hereby repealed.

#### PREVENTION OF AND PUNISHMENT FOR LYNCHING

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1507) to assure to persons within the jurisdiction of every State the equal protection of the laws and to punish the crime of lynching.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Let the Chair make a statement. A number of Senators are not here, but the Chair, nevertheless, ought to make the statement.

Technically, the Senate has under consideration the amendment offered to the antilynching bill by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS], as modified. Any Senator who obtains the floor, technically speaking, is addressing himself to that particular amendment. His remarks on it constitute one speech. The Chair does not think he ought to hold that that is the case when Senators present other matters, but thinks, in order so to hold, that the remarks should be directed to the particular amendment which is pending, or to the bill.

To illustrate, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO] has just had the floor to submit a certain matter. Nevertheless, he has had the floor, and the Senate has under consideration the particular amendment stated by the Chair. The Chair thinks he ought to make this statement, so that when some Senator makes the technical objection that another Senator has had the floor for the second time, the Chair will not so hold under conditions such as he has just related.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Have I had the floor?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Tennessee has had the floor several times.

Mr. McKELLAR. On this bill?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair thought the Senator asked whether he had technically had the floor more than once.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no.

The VICE PRESIDENT. So far as the Chair knows, and as the Chair is advised by the clerk at the desk, the Senator from Tennessee has had the floor one time.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Although the Senator has addressed the Chair and transacted some business on other occasions.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes, sir; I realize that, but I thank the Vice President.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I desire to make a parliamentary inquiry so that Senators may be guided in the future.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yesterday the Senator from Louisiana yielded the floor and thereby completed his first speech, and the Senator from New Hampshire took the floor and made a speech on the T. V. A. for an hour or two. Technically he was speaking, not on the bill now pending, but on the amendment, and that counts as one speech by him on the amendment, does it not?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Undoubtedly. The Chair was referring to parliamentary matters such as the one to which the Senator from Mississippi has called attention.

Mr. BARKLEY. The rule announced by the Vice President should not apply when we are about to conclude a day's session.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Not at all. It seems to the Chair that the address of the Senator from New Hampshire should be counted as one speech on the pending amendment. That would be the interpretation of the present occupant of the chair.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I desire to state the reason for my parliamentary inquiry. Yesterday the Senator from New Hampshire spoke on the T. V. A., and today I have been preparing a speech in reply. That is why I asked whether I could make another speech on the pending amendment, because as soon as I can get the floor, although I do not desire to proceed ahead of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], I propose to reply to the speech made yesterday by the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, before the motion for a recess is made, I wish again to express the hope that I will be recognized to follow the Senator from Louisiana to speak on the pending so-called antilynching bill.

#### RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, January 20, 1938, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 19, 1938

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, we pray Thee that we may strike hands in unquenchable faith in our Master; may we lift up our hearts to register our allegiance to Him. Inspire us with that love which overleaps analysis and asks no other rule of conduct that all may feel but cannot explain. We pray that it may strengthen and chasten us to dwell together in the bonds of brotherhood; thus may the Lord God be magnified in us. We praise Thee for the abiding promise: The righteous shall be in everlasting remembrance and the memory of the just shall be blessed. May we be persuaded that neither death nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature shall be able to separate us from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord. In His holy name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

#### COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

JANUARY 18, 1938.

The Honorable WILLIAM B. BANKHEAD,  
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Sir: Desiring to be temporarily absent from my office, I hereby designate Mr. H. Newlin Megill, an official in my office, to sign any and all papers for me which he would be authorized to sign by virtue of this designation and of clause 4, rule III, of the House.

Respectfully yours,

SOUTH TRIMBLE,  
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

#### THE LATE PEDRO GUEVARA

Mr. PAREDES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from the Philippine Islands?

There was no objection.

Mr. PAREDES. Mr. Speaker, it is with the most profound sorrow that I announce to the House the death of a former Member, the Honorable Pedro Guevara, for 13 years the Resident Commissioner to the United States for the Philippine Islands.

Since his early childhood Mr. Guevara dedicated all of his energies to the service of the Philippines, his country. When still a young man he served during the revolution in the Philippine Islands against Spain, and later on, when peace was established, Mr. Guevara held different elective positions, first as municipal councilor of his native town, then

twice as a member of the Philippine Assembly, and twice afterward as a member of the Philippine Senate. He finally was elected Resident Commissioner to the United States from the Philippine Islands, in which latter capacity he served continuously for 13 years and faithfully voiced the wishes of the Filipino people. He represented our cause well and with ability defended the rights of the Filipino people against reactionary legislation. His career in this Congress culminated with the approval of the first independence law, popularly known as the Hare-Hawes-Cutting Act, and the present independence law, the Tydings-McDuffie Act.

Mr. Guevara was a fighter, but, at the same time, many of you who knew him will remember his friendly and kind disposition and his genial character. He died as he lived—a fighter. He died while fighting for a cause that was entrusted to him as a lawyer during an argument that he was delivering before the highest court in the Philippines. The heart failure that took him to his death struck him for the first time while arguing a case for the Filipino people before the House Committee on Insular Affairs.

His death will, I know, be mourned by those who knew him. With his death, Mr. Speaker, my country sustains a distinct and irreparable loss.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, the House has heard with deep sorrow of the passing of our late associate and friend, Pedro Guevara, who served with distinction in this body for over 12 years as the representative of the Philippine people. In all that time his work here was characterized by fidelity and ability.

We regret more than we can say his passing, and in his death the Philippine people have lost a faithful and loyal representative who served them well and wisely.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I was asked many times during the afternoon yesterday why I had been away so long, and I believe I ought to say something with reference to it.

The fact is, I was called away by the very serious illness of my wife 3 days before the end of the special session. I have been with her from that time until day before yesterday when she arrived back here with me and is now in the hospital. It is needless to say that she is somewhat better. She was able to make the trip without difficulty and is better this morning.

May I also call attention to the fact that during the 7 years I have served here this is the first time I have been away for more than 1 day, and only three times have I been away for that length of time. I am glad to be back here to do my duty.

#### CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

The SPEAKER. This is Calendar Wednesday. The Clerk will call the committees.

#### FLOWAGE EASEMENT ON CERTAIN CEDED CHIPPEWA INDIAN LANDS (MINNESOTA)

Mr. McREYNOLDS (when the Committee on Foreign Affairs was called). Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill H. R. 8432, to provide for a flowage easement on certain ceded Chippewa Indian lands bordering Lake of the Woods, Warroad River, and Rainy River, Minn., and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McREYNOLDS]?

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have no objection to considering this bill in the Committee

of the Whole. The gentleman did not make his request to bring up two bills under similar conditions?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. The other bill, I may say to the gentleman from New York, that I thought was on the calendar has already been passed.

Mr. FISH. I am very sorry.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this the only bill the gentleman intends to call up today?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. I have only one other bill that will not take very much time.

Mr. BOILEAU. Will any other committee call up a bill today?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. I do not think so.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That all lands bordering on Lake of the Woods, Warroad River, and Rainy River, Minn., ceded and relinquished to the United States by the Chippewa Indians pursuant to the act entitled "An act for the relief and civilization of the Chippewa Indians in the State of Minnesota," approved January 14, 1889, and still owned by the United States, shall be subject to a flowage easement up to elevation 1,064 sea-level datum, as required by the treaty of February 24, 1925 (44 Stat. L. 2108), between the United States and Great Britain and the act of May 22, 1926 (44 Stat. L. 617), carrying the treaty into effect, as amended by the act of April 18, 1928 (45 Stat. L. 431), which authorized and directed the Secretary of War to acquire by purchase or condemnation flowage easements upon all lands in the United States, bordering on Lake of the Woods, Warroad River, and Rainy River. All rights and equities of the Indians in and to the lands affected by said easement are hereby extinguished. In order to compensate the Indians for their rights and equities in said lands, the Secretary of War is hereby authorized to cause the sum of \$11,740.75, less any amount that may be found to have been previously paid by the United States and for which it has not been fully reimbursed to be transferred out of any balance of appropriations heretofore made for protective works and measures, Lake of the Woods and Rainy River, to the credit of the Chippewa Indians in the State of Minnesota as part of the fund created by section 7 of the said act of January 14, 1889 (25 Stat. L. 642).

SEC. 2. That Executive Orders Nos. 4867 and 5025, dated April 28, 1928, and January 14, 1929, respectively, withdrawing certain ceded lands from homestead entry for the purpose of facilitating acquisition of the flowage easement aforesaid, are hereby revoked: *Provided*, That such of the lands lying wholly or partly below elevation 1,064 sea-level datum shall forever be and remain subject to the right of the United States to overflow same or any part thereof, and that all patents issued for the said lands shall expressly reserve to the United States the right to overflow and flood said lands up to elevation 1,064. No moneys received from the sale or other disposition of any lands for which the Indians receive payment under section 1 hereof shall be placed to the credit of the Indians.

Mr. McREYNOLDS (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the bill may be dispensed with.

Mr. KNUTSON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I notice the Representative from the district wherein these lands are located is absent from the floor at the moment.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. I may say to the gentleman I will explain the bill, so the gentleman can have no objection to it.

Mr. KNUTSON. I withhold the objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I may say to the gentleman this bill merely provides for payment to the Chippewa Indians for some lands that were ceded by them to the United States Government along the Warroad and Rainy Rivers. When homesteads were granted the Government was to pay the Chippewa Indians \$1.25 an acre for this land. The gentleman is familiar with the treaty entered into between the United States and Canada to raise the Lake of the Woods 1,064 feet. In doing this, the lake will overflow a great deal of this land. An Executive order of the President has been issued taking this land out of entry. About 3,000 acres are left, for which the Indians would not be paid. The money is already available, and this bill is merely for the purpose of paying the Chippewa Indians the \$1.25 per acre for the land taken out of homestead on account of this agreement.



Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. Are these the Chippewas of Minnesota or the Red Lake Band of Chippewas?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. The report states:

The lands withdrawn from entry were ceded to the United States by the Chippewa Indians pursuant to the act for the relief and civilization of the Chippewa Indians in the State of Minnesota, approved January 14, 1889.

This bill is simply doing justice to the Indians.

Mr. KNUTSON. I believe it is a very meritorious measure.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. I thank the gentleman.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the resolution (H. J. Res. 530) authorizing the President to invite foreign countries to participate in the ceremonies to commemorate the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the national ratification of the Constitution of the United States in Philadelphia, Pa., June 17-21, 1938.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Whereas there is to be held in Philadelphia, Pa., on June 17 to 21, 1938, ceremonies to commemorate the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the ratification of the Constitution of the United States, under the auspices of the Pennsylvania Constitution Commemoration Committee and the United States Constitution Sesquicentennial Commission, designed to depict and exhibit the progress and accomplishment of the United States during 150 years of constitutional government which, because of its influence on world affairs during this period, makes desirable the participation of foreign governments with the intent that it will encourage cordial relations among the nations of the world; and

Whereas, because of the location and purpose, scope, and aims of the anniversary ceremonies, they are deserving of the support and encouragement of the Government of the United States of America: Therefore be it

*Resolved, etc.,* That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and respectfully requested by proclamation, or in such manner as he may deem proper, to invite foreign countries and nations to such anniversary ceremonies with a request that they participate therein.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Dorsey], the author of this resolution, for the purpose of explaining it.

Mr. DORSEY. Mr. Speaker, from June 17-21, 1938, the State of Pennsylvania intends to celebrate the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the formation and ratification of the Constitution with a week's celebration in the city of Philadelphia, the cradle of liberty. The purpose of this resolution is to give the President authorization to invite foreign nations to participate in this celebration, in order to promote and encourage cordial relations among the nations of the world. When the 13 struggling colonies won freedom, the world was wondering what they were going to do with it. In 1787 this question was answered definitely in Independence Hall, Philadelphia, just as they had proclaimed political separation on that spot 11 years before. Down through the years that instrument of government has guided the destinies of the Nation. It has seen us through peace and war and through prosperity and adversity. With its checks and balances, although sometimes we have put too much stress on the checks and have forgotten the balances, it has protected the liberties of our people. Justice Story said that if our Government fails it will probably be the last experiment in self-government by the people. I would remind the people of the Nation, and particularly the rising generation, of the importance of the Constitution as a protector of their liberties and of democracy itself. Periodically, through the celebration of its formation, their attention should be drawn to its provisions, to the struggles of the founding fathers in their efforts to establish a foundation upon which a government of, for, and by the people might operate in the interest of the people.

In 1887 the centennial of the Constitution was celebrated in the city of Philadelphia, at which time foreign nations

were invited and did participate. The celebration this year is for the same purpose. This resolution merely authorizes the President to invite representatives of the nations to participate in the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the formation of the Constitution, and no funds are asked.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DORSEY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman states no appropriation is attached to this resolution?

Mr. DORSEY. None whatsoever.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Is the gentleman coming in later with a request for funds?

Mr. DORSEY. Not at all. The State of Pennsylvania has appropriated \$200,000 for the celebration.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. From that fund will come the money which will be spent in entertaining these foreign representatives?

Mr. DORSEY. The invitation is merely sent to them. There will be no expense whatever involved.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. If a number of foreign representatives are invited to come to Philadelphia, of course, you must expect to entertain them. Who is going to pay for that?

Mr. DORSEY. The entertainment expense will be borne by the State of Pennsylvania and under the direction of the Pennsylvania Constitution Commemoration Committee.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. No exhibition of any kind is connected with this?

Mr. DORSEY. None whatsoever.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DORSEY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. Has this matter been submitted to the Director General of the United States Constitution Sesquicentennial Commission, and has it his approval?

Mr. DORSEY. This has been discussed with him and has his approval.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Fish].

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support this resolution with the understanding it will not be followed by any request for appropriations from the Congress to provide for the travel expense and the entertainment of the representatives of the foreign nations who may accept.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. If the gentleman will yield, I may state I am entirely in accord with the gentleman on that feature. No money is to be appropriated in connection with this matter.

Mr. FISH. I have often heard gentlemen take the floor of the House to sponsor legislation and assure Congress there would be no call in the future for appropriations, but somehow or other appropriations were called for. I am sure now, in view of the statement of the sponsor and of the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, there will be no appropriation.

However, if there were appropriations, I would still be for this resolution because I can see that it might serve very useful purposes in the world and be highly educational. For example, if the Governments of Germany, Italy, and Soviet Russia should accept—and we hope they will, and send representatives to Philadelphia to help commemorate the formation of our constitutional form of government—they might take back home some of our ideas of constitutional government, and we might set an example to the rest of the world and help convert some of the governments that have forgotten there is such a thing as constitutional government. But I have taken this time to call the attention of the sponsor of the legislation to the fact it is very important, if you are to have a celebration commemorating the formation of the Constitution, that it should be an accurate one based on actual records.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. Bloom] for example, has spoken at length throughout the country and has stated that someone, whose name I do not recall at the moment, had penned the Constitution. It is my understanding from

reading history that Gouverneur Morris, of the State of New York, was the penman of the Constitution. He was on the small committee on style that framed the Constitution and himself penned the original copy. It may be there is some unknown clerk who has been discovered recently by Mr. BLOOM who may have engrossed it, and he should be known as the engrosser of the Constitution, but not as the penman of it. Thousands upon thousands of these speeches of Mr. BLOOM have been sent throughout the Nation taking away from Gouverneur Morris, one of the ablest men of his time and an outstanding patriot and citizen of the State of New York, the actual penman of the Constitution, that great honor, and has given the honor to some unknown clerk who was merely the engrosser of the Constitution and had nothing to do with either the writing or the penmanship in connection with that great document under which our country is still governed.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. MASON. Does not the gentleman think, in connection with the invitations that are to be sent out to the governments of Italy, Germany and the others, we should include in the invitation the specific statement "that this is the City of Brotherly Love that we are inviting you to visit, and we hope that designation will have some effect upon your attitude in accepting the invitation"?

Mr. FISH. Knowing something about the city of Philadelphia, I am sure they will never overlook that great heritage and will take every advantage of it. In connection with the celebration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the Constitution at Philadelphia we are likewise having a celebration in New York City the following year to commemorate, not the writing of the Constitution but the formation of our constitutional form of government, the actual putting into effect of the Federal Constitution in New York City in April 1789, by the inauguration of George Washington as our first President.

I cannot see how this will conflict with the interests of the New York World's Fair which is aimed to commemorate the formation of our constitutional form of government, but I do think that if you invite these foreign representatives over here it may serve a useful purpose at this time. The Communists, the Socialists, and the radicals will tell you that the Constitution is a scrap of paper, that it represent wealth, special privilege, Wall Street, and reaction. We who are here in Congress know that the Constitution is the greatest charter of human liberty ever devised by the mind of man. It represents our rights and liberties as a free, sovereign people. It is a barrier against the autocracies and dictatorships of the Old World, and, above all, as Al Smith has said, it is the civil bible of America. It represents the rights and liberties of the minorities, racial and religious, and no matter what happens, Republicans and Democrats alike, we propose to maintain these rights and liberties as free, sovereign Americans under our constitutional and republican form of government.

It makes no difference whether these Old World nations go to the right or to the left, into autocracies or dictatorships, fascism or communism, we believe all the more in these free institutions of ours under our constitutional form of government, and regardless of partisanship we propose to preserve these rights and liberties for ourselves and for generations of free, unborn American citizens. [Applause.]

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. KELLER. I thought the Constitution was for the purpose of asserting and guaranteeing the rights of the great majority of the American people, quite as well as the minority.

Mr. FISH. The gentleman will note that it likewise guarantees the rights of the minorities, and that is exactly what I said. I will also call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that it provides for checks and balances and for three separate and independent branches of government, equal and independent, the executive, the judicial, and the legis-

lative. [Applause.] I think it is well to call the attention of gentlemen on the Democratic side to these facts at this time.

Mr. KELLER. Then put them in their right order, the legislative, executive, and judicial.

Mr. FISH. No; I agree that the Constitution states the legislative first, but with the help of Members of Congress on your side you have almost abolished or greatly restricted the legislative and it should go at the bottom of the list at the present time.

Mr. KELLER. That is what the gentleman says.

Mr. FISH. That is precisely what I say but I had no hand in it. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time. [Applause.]

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, there seems to be no opposition to this joint resolution and I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, that is all the Committee on Foreign Affairs has today.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the next two committees—the Military Affairs Committee and the Naval Committee—have nothing they desire to call up today under the rule, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under Calendar Wednesday be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION—PERMISSION TO SIT DURING SESSION OF THE HOUSE

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization be permitted to sit during the session of the House this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including a radio address delivered by the Honorable Joseph P. Kennedy, Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, with reference to the merchant marine and Pacific coast.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### NAVY DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1939

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 8993) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, and for other purposes. Pending that motion I ask unanimous consent that general debate upon the bill proceed for the remainder of today and until 1:30 o'clock p. m. tomorrow, at which time the reading for amendment shall begin.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. I asked permission of the chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations in charge of the time on the Democratic side to speak for about 20 minutes today, and I would like to have that time. I hope the gentleman can assure me that the time will be taken care of this afternoon.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas called only this morning. He did not mention his desire for time yesterday. I stated to the gentleman from Texas I would assure him that he would have some time, but that I could not promise him 20 minutes, that it would depend on whether all those who requested time used all of their time. I shall be glad to arrange for 20 minutes for the gentleman, if it is possible, and if not for the entire 20 minutes, for such time as I may be able to give.



Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, under the old rule we could get permission in advance to speak sometime during the day. Under the new rule we must wait until all of the legislative business of the day is transacted before we may speak, and that is usually late in the afternoon, which is not a very satisfactory time. I asked permission, it is true, only this morning, but I was under the impression that another person, a colleague, had asked permission for me before today. I was here the other day to listen to my colleague from Texas, Mr. MARTIN DIES, speak. He was on the list, about first, one day. He sat here all of that day, while members of the committee would come in, and they would be put ahead of the gentleman from Texas. He did not get to speak that day. The next day I was told he was placed first on the list, and the next day members of committees would come along, and they would be put ahead of Mr. DIES, and all of that day he sat here and did not get to speak. The next day he did not get to speak. If the committee is going to permit members of the committee to take up all of the time and the chairman of the committee—

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Texas yield to me?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Does the gentleman mean to leave the impression in the House that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] has been unable to get as much time as he wanted to speak to the House?

Mr. PATMAN. I am quoting his particular case, because I was interested in what Mr. DIES was going to say. I object to that policy of the committee putting other members of the committee ahead of those of us who ask for time. Of course, it is all right where they are members of the particular subcommittee.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I assure the gentleman that he will have an opportunity to speak before debate is closed.

Mr. PATMAN. With that understanding, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. UMSTEAD. I cannot promise the gentleman 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from North Carolina that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Navy Department appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 8993, with Mr. THOMASON of Texas in the chair.

The Clerk reported the title of the bill.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to the time that has been used by each side?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina has consumed 2 hours and 4 minutes and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER] 1 hour.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAVERICK].

TWO BATTLESHIPS, \$150,000,000—ALSO SAILORS, UPKEEP, MORE MONEY

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Chairman, when I make a speech on this floor I am ordinarily very positive, and at least I think I know what I am talking about, whether I do or not. This naval bill, however, has me worried; I do not know what to do. My mind is not made up.

This bill that we have before us today provides for two battleships. Three years ago the price of a battleship was something like \$50,000,000. Then we found that a battleship was priced at \$60,000,000, and now we find that the cost of a battleship is something like \$70,000,000.

When we provide for two battleships in round figures we first provide something like 140 to 150 million dollars, and

then we have to have sailors and have to provide for the upkeep of those two battleships.

BATTLESHIPS OFFENSIVE—BRITANNIA RULES THE WAVES

I understand battleships are used principally for offensive purposes, not for defensive purposes. It is well known all over the world that the purpose of battleships is offensive, not defensive. I am told that England has so many battleships, that Japan has so many battleships—and that, therefore, we ought to have so many battleships. I do not know whether that is a fair comparison at all in reference to our country, because we are not supposed to be a Nation which has any international ambitions or hope of aggrandizement. Moreover, we have practically all our Nation on one continent.

England is a maritime power. Her life is dependent on her Navy. Britannia rules the waves, and when she stops, no more Britannia. Our life is not dependent on our Navy, and we are supposed to be a defensive power. We do not want to rule the waves; we want to rule ourselves on American soil.

Concerning the two battleships. How many planes could we build for the cost of these two battleships if we are really a defensive power? Planes can be built anywhere from \$2,000 to \$50,000; and with \$140,000,000, or \$150,000,000, whatever it is, we could build the greatest air fleet in the world. It would be bigger than that of England and of Russia combined. As far as I am concerned, if a committee would bring on this floor an appropriation for a large air fleet and plenty of airplanes I would be much happier voting for it than I would be voting for two battleships. I believe from conversations I have heard in this House that it is the opinion of the House that we need airships much more than we do battleships.

BIG NAVY, ORIENT—DO ADMIRALS MAKE FOREIGN POLICY?

Mr. Chairman, I am entirely without technical information in reference to battleships. I do not know whether we need two battleships or not. Maybe I am going to vote for these two battleships; maybe I am going to vote for this bigger Navy; I do not know, but certainly we should understand more about these battleships before we go any further.

It seems to me that we are getting ourselves in a position of building up a big Navy in order to protect our interests in the Orient and in places in which we have no particular business.

It seems to me that is what we are doing. It seems to me that the admirals of the Navy are the ones who are directing our foreign policy instead of the State Department and the Congress of the United States.

All I wanted to do was to get these observations in the Record. I am very doubtful that we are doing exactly right by building more battleships, because they are offensive weapons that are used to go to far-distant places. Insofar as being of any value for defensive purposes, they are clumsy and are probably not worth 50 airplanes.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAVERICK. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. I agree with the gentleman from Texas and feel that it would be the part of wisdom to apply a substantial part of the money allocated to battleships to the construction of additional aircraft for defense.

I am not in sympathy with the recent statement of Admiral Leahy that we should build ship for ship with the other leading nations of the world.

There is a mad, insane race for armaments going on in the world today, which is inconsistent with world peace and stable governments.

Mr. MAVERICK. One Member said to me, and maybe he is right, that from the viewpoint of what other governments are doing, we are not going beyond them; but that is just like buying an automobile because the Joneses bought one.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAVERICK. I yield.

Mr. GEARHART. The gentleman has said that the battleship is just an offensive instrument.

Mr. MAVERICK. I said it is "principally" used as an offensive instrument.

Mr. GEARHART. Does not the gentleman, as a person experienced in warfare, having served in the unfortunate catastrophe of the World War, know that the best defensive methods very often require the use of offensive tactics?

Mr. MAVERICK. Yes, that is true; I agree with that, but we have a good Navy now; we have a good Army, and we have a good Marine Corps. The National Guard and Reserve Corps are at the highest efficiency in the Nation's history. Our position from a military and a naval viewpoint is 10 times superior to anything it was previous to the World War; we are in a much better position. We have an Army and a Navy of which we can be proud.

Let us not hurry about this thing; let us not go too fast. I doubt very seriously when this Presidential message comes in—I have not read it yet—that I am going to vote for any greater increase than is carried in this bill. Of course, I will have to wait and see.

Mr. LUECKE of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAVERICK. I yield.

Mr. LUECKE of Michigan. Can the gentleman tell us what part these big ships played in the last war?

Mr. MAVERICK. I do not know that they played any part, as far as I am concerned, except some of them convoyed us over there to a foreign war. I think we need fewer battleships but more airplanes, a better mechanized and more modern Army, and, of course, a fast-moving Navy with many little ships instead of a few big, clumsy ones. However, I am not informed from a technical viewpoint.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAVERICK. I yield.

Mr. UMSTEAD. The gentleman understands, I hope, that the two battleships provided in this bill are battleships to be used as replacements of ships that are overage.

Mr. MAVERICK. How old are they?

Mr. UMSTEAD. They will be more than 26 years old before any of these ships now being laid down are completed.

Mr. MAVERICK. I am glad to hear the gentleman give me that information. I did not know that before.

Mr. UMSTEAD. The gentleman understands, of course, that we have 15 capital ships. At the present time the life of a battleship is considered as 26 years. The two we are building and the two here authorized are to replace overage battleships already a part of our Navy.

Mr. MAVERICK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAVERICK. I yield.

Mr. BOILEAU. When the amendment stage is reached, if I can get recognition, I propose to offer an amendment to strike out the appropriation for battleships.

If the amendment is agreed to, at the proper time I propose to offer another amendment to appropriate an equal amount for bombing and other planes. Will the gentleman support those amendments?

Mr. MAVERICK. I do not know whether I will or not. I might support an amendment which would cut out one battleship and take the other \$70,000,000 and use it for airplanes. I just do not know.

Mr. STARNES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAVERICK. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. STARNES. The gentleman has raised a very interesting point. May I say to him some of the big planes cost as much as \$293,000 each? He understands, of course, that while 2,500 planes could be built probably for the cost of two battleships, yet the cost of maintenance would be far more; and the average life of the airplane would probably be 4 years instead of 20 or 25 years.

Mr. MAVERICK. You could build a fleet of small pursuit and bombing planes for, we will say, \$70,000,000—one battleship—and have \$70,000,000—the other battleship—in addi-

tion to maintain them. That, of course, is an off-hand statement, for I realize what the gentleman says is true. But we will have to admit that battleships come expensive—a terrific burden for the people to bear, and of doubtful value, at least comparatively speaking.

As I said in the beginning, I am not well informed from a technical basis. We need much more technical information, and I think before we proceed very far, we should get this technical information.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS—THE NECESSITY FOR BATTLESHIPS DISCUSSED

Mr. Chairman, with permission to extend my remarks, and to include further information concerning the matter of battleships, I am going to include some testimony from the hearings of the subcommittee.

The testimony is as follows:

Mr. UMSTEAD. Admiral, before leaving the subject of battleships, I should like to have you make any additional statement you may desire to make for the record in connection with the necessity, as the Department sees it, for two additional battleships at this time.

Admiral LEAHY. The necessity for two additional battleships at this time is that two of our battleships now in commission are reaching an age when it will be uneconomical from the point of view of efficiency to continue them in service. These battleships should be replaced when they reach an age that makes them inefficient compared with the battleships of other naval powers; we have now arrived at that condition, and it will be necessary, in order that the United States Fleet may have an efficiency comparable to that of other navies, that we engage in an orderly replacement of our average battleships.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Admiral, is there anywhere in the tables prepared for the record a comparison of the age of the battleships of other nations and ours?

Admiral LEAHY. That is included in the tables of this statement, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. UMSTEAD. I believe that 26 years is the age now set up for battleships.

Admiral LEAHY. Twenty-six years is the age for battleships set up in the 1936 London Treaty.

Mr. UMSTEAD. And that still prevails with reference to that particular item, so far as we are concerned?

Admiral LEAHY. We are following that provision of the 1936 treaty; but it is necessary to understand that there is no treaty limitation and that we are not required to build only replacement battleships. We can, under the treaty, build new ones in any number that suits us.

Mr. UMSTEAD. But in our program we are adhering to the terms of the original treaty?

Admiral LEAHY. In our program for this year we are adhering to the terms of the original treaty limitations.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Of course, the entire Vinson-Trammell Act was based upon a program of adherence to the London-Washington Treaty.

Admiral LEAHY. That is correct, sir.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Admiral, the fact that a ship is 26 years old does not necessarily mean that it is no longer useful, does it?

Admiral LEAHY. It does not. A ship 26 years of age should be of very real use in the Navy, but if other naval powers build later ships that are more efficient, it is then necessary in order to maintain our relative naval standing that we also replace our ships as they become over age.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question?

Mr. UMSTEAD. Yes.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Admiral, this seems to be a point of some considerable importance. It costs, for example, \$7,000,000 to modernize a battleship. Assuming that is the figure merely for the purpose of illustration, would it not be better to build one or two battleships, leaving the old battleships in the condition they are, from the point of view of strategy and policy of the Navy?

Admiral LEAHY. That is the present policy of the Navy Department, Governor Scrugham, to economize on the expenditures for improvement of the old battleships with the purpose of obtaining replacements when they become so old as to be not sufficiently efficient.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. That point has not been sufficiently stressed, but I think it has quite a bearing on these appropriations that we are called upon to make.

I ask that the above testimony in the next to last question asked by Mr. UMSTEAD be particularly noted. In it he asks if a 26-year-old ship necessarily means that it is no longer useful, and Admiral Leahy answers in the negative. The point made by the Admiral is not that a 26-year-old ship is of no further use, but that other nations are building ships and so we must build more ships in order to maintain "our relative standing."

This seems to me to be the whole crux of the question. If we needed 50 battleships I would vote for them; but if we do not need even two, and they are obsolete and unnecessary,



or not as effective as airplanes, then we should not have them.

**WEIGH-IN PRIZE FIGHTERS, OR LITTLE BOYS BEHIND HIGH-BOARD FENCE**

This question is, of course, not merely the matter of whether we need more battleships. It is also a question which involves domestic and, particularly, foreign affairs. Naval affairs in the hands of admirals who have big ideas are liable to become foreign affairs, and that will be a seriously detrimental thing.

The idea of getting more ships to have as much as others, seems a good deal like weighing-in prize fighters. It may be, if we keep a lot of little American boys behind our high-board fence and not send out any heavy prize fighters, that we will not get in any fights.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Wood.]

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Chairman, I desire to address myself to a supposed news item that appeared in the Merry-Go-Round column of the Washington Herald on last Sunday. This article purports to give an account of an interview that someone had with me and it also purports to have found out that there had been a secret meeting among what they termed the "Young Turks" of the House. It also makes the statement that I made certain references to the officials of the American Federation of Labor.

The whole item is a deliberate falsehood out of whole cloth and does not represent any truthful occurrence that has happened. I want to read the article to you. It is headed "Revolt of Young Turks of the House:"

The "Young Turks" of the House—the bloc of about 60 left-wing Democrats, Republicans, and Progressives who comprise the New Deal spearhead in the lower chamber—have decided to disregard completely the A. F. of L. in the new drive for wage-hour legislation.

Ordinarily they are the Federation's staunchest supporters. But at a secret caucus recently they turned thumbs down and heaved some verbal brickbats in its direction.

GARDNER WITHROW, La Follette Progressive, started the argument by contending that they had to convert the A. F. of L. if the administration's wage-hour bill was to be put through the House. ALBERT THOMAS, Texas member of the Labor Committee, agreed with him. This touched off a storm of dissent.

"I have been a member of the A. F. of L. for 40 years," said REUBEN T. WOOD, who besides representing the Sixth Missouri District, has been president of the State Federation of Labor for 25 years, "and I want to say that Bill Green and the other so-called big shots of the Federation are not speaking for the rank and file when they oppose this legislation.

"There is no use wasting time going to see Green and his crowd. They are not talking for labor on this issue. Don't waste your energy and breath."

"Mr. Wood is absolutely correct," interposed Pennsylvania's scrappy ROBERT G. ALLEN. "Why bother trying to get that outfit on your side? We changed the bill to meet their demands."

Mr. Chairman, in the first place, I have not been a member of the American Federation of Labor for 40 years; and in the next place, I never have engaged in nor been a party to any secret caucus or conference on the wage-hour legislation except a number of conferences I held with officials of the American Federation of Labor, including Mr. Green himself and the members of the Labor Committee. I never have in my life used the vernacular of the underworld in referring to a man as a "big shot." I do not know where Pearson and Allen got this misinformation, but it seems as though the Merry-Go-Round has been going so fast that their informers have gotten dizzy and have imagined things, or probably had to manufacture some news to keep the Merry-Go-Round from falling down.

We all know there are certain vultures that infest the Halls of this Congress for no other purpose than to get something that seems to be information, which they supply to these syndicated writers for profit. It seems as though the Merry-Go-Round operated by Pearson and Allen has degenerated into an institution of not only intrigue but of harrowing rumor to create dissension among Members of this House and the American labor movement.

May I say that I have known William Green for the past 25 years, and I never met a more upright, honest, conscientious, or fearless man in my life than William Green. I

have also been acquainted with John L. Lewis, of the C. I. O., and I can say the same of both men.

If it had not been for the insidious propaganda that has been heralded throughout the Nation by 80 percent of the metropolitan press by attributing inflaming statements by the one group against the other, I am sure the C. I. O. and the American Federation of Labor would have patched up their differences a long time ago. It seems to have been the stock in trade of the press to publish such things that would create dissension and bitterness between these two great elements of organized labor.

Mr. Chairman, I resent this article and challenge Pearson and Allen to give me the source of their misinformation or to substantiate one single assertion in their scurrilous news item. Of course, we all know that these syndicate writers write because they make money out of it; but I do not want the inference to be left by anyone that I am in any wise at variance with William Green or any of the officials of the American Federation of Labor. I know them. I am and I have been president of the Missouri State Federation of Labor for 25 years. That organization has followed out the policies of the American Federation of Labor in all those years. I resent any newspaper writer, whether he be a syndicate writer or one of these vultures that hang around the lobbies of this House, giving anything other than real, true information. I am not referring to the boys in the press gallery who make an honest effort to give to the world the real news with reference to the happenings of the Congress.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania. May I say to the gentleman I concur with the statement which he has made. My name appeared with his in that article. I never made the statement attributed to me. I thank the gentleman. And I may say further I was not in any meeting with the gentleman.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Chairman, I think Mr. Pearson and Mr. Allen should be called upon to divulge the source of their information. I call upon them to retract this scurrilous article which purports to give the truth of what might have happened in some mysterious caucus or conference of the so-called "Young Turks" of this House. My record in the American labor movement and as a Member of Congress is an open book. I do not and never have engaged in any secret caucus or conference of any kind for the purpose of maligning the character of any man in public life. I believe William Green has done a fine job as president of the American Federation of Labor. If we, as Members of Congress, and if the press and the people of this Nation would allow both wings of the labor movement to carry on their own business I am sure within the very near future this split which has occurred in the labor movement would be soon remedied. This is not a matter of principle, it is a matter of policy. We all know the disagreement which has happened has been brought on by mass production, and by the growth of the technological age.

I hope GARDNER WITHROW, Progressive, of Wisconsin, will tell the House whether he made the statement he is purported to have made in this so-called secret conference.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I must take exception to one statement made by the chairman of the subcommittee yesterday with reference to the duty of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Navy. In my opinion, the Committee on Appropriations has a very definite part to play in fixing the naval policy of the country. While, of course, legislation is the basis upon which our naval needs are provided for originally, if we are not willing to pay the bill, or if we curtail the expenditures which are asked for by the establishment, we can have something to do in fixing the policy. We can fix the policy just as much as the father in the home who has to pro-

vide the purse for the family can fix the policy of the family. Of course, I know there are some fathers in some homes who are either reluctant or fearful to assume that responsibility.

As for myself and as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I believe not only a duty but a responsibility is placed upon those who are members of the Committee on Appropriations to determine, and to determine very definitely, what the national-defense program of the country is to be. I am unalterably opposed to letting a legislative committee have its own way or permitting the Department to determine without limitation what the naval policy of the Nation is to be.

Mr. Chairman, no more important appropriation bill than the one we are now considering will come before the Congress. It is of vital importance to every man, woman, and child in America. It affects not only our domestic welfare, but it may have far-reaching results on our relations with the other nations of the world. It goes to the heart of our national defense. It involves the expenditure at this time of large sums, entailing a commensurate demand upon the resources of our people. At the same time it necessitates assuming the obligation to provide in the future for the projects and operations which are being inaugurated and expanded under this bill. I submit, Mr. Chairman, it should have our conscientious consideration, our careful analysis, and our deliberative judgment.

Those who oppose the bill should have ample opportunity to express their opinion and register their objections. Much is at stake here. Neither partisanship nor passion should influence our decision. Neither should the fervor of fanaticism be permitted to carry us to impractical conclusions. Certainly politics has no place here. We may entertain honest differences of opinion on the question of our needs in naval strength and how these needs may be met most advantageously and economically. But, I hope that an overwhelming majority of the House by its support of this measure will declare to the world, what I believe to be the voice of America, that our Navy is ready for any emergency which may threaten our peace or our independence. As for myself, I believe that we need a Navy second to none as the first arm of our national defense, and as the surest safeguard of our peace as a Nation.

The chairman of the committee has given you a detailed statement of the items carried in the bill, together with the justifications, which must be considered in reaching an honest conclusion. A repetition of these statements and justifications is neither necessary nor desirable. His presentation has been adequate and persuasive. I shall confine myself, therefore, to a presentation of the general subject of our national policies as they relate themselves to and are a part of the problems presented by the consideration of the present bill.

We face a troubled world today. A gloomy picture presents itself as we survey world conditions. War and the fear of war beset us on all sides. Old controversies that we thought had been buried long since have been resurrected, and new discords have arisen as a result of the acute economic and political conditions which confront many of the nations. Again the desire of dictators to continue their domination over their own helpless and submissive people has prompted the invasion of defenseless or inadequately prepared nations for the purpose of self-aggrandizement and self-glorification. Many nations of the world have become an armed camp again with new devices of destruction pressed into service and additional complements of men conscripted daily to man and manage these machines of death. We shudder as we contemplate the prospect. Hatred and suspicion have fastened their leprous clutches upon men charged with the responsibility of guiding the affairs of nations. The unclean and noxious infection has spread like a deadly contagion into the hearts of millions of men who are bound by an inexorable rule of obedience to their leaders, but who still cherish the hope that they may be permitted to follow their peaceful pursuits.

Old methods of intrigue, deception, and complicity, which it was hoped could cast no longer any aspersions on the

motives of men engaged in diplomatic relations, have reasserted themselves, thus destroying completely the beneficial effects of candor and frankness in international conversations.

This is a big step backward. It is a retreat which will take years to overcome. I submit, Mr. Chairman, intrigue, deception, complicity, these sinister influences never have contributed nor will they ever contribute one thing to mutual understandings and amicable agreements. They lead inevitably to misunderstandings, animosities, hatreds, war. The outlook, Mr. Chairman, is indeed gloomy. Nay, it is worse—it is foreboding and fearful.

In this welter of confusion and conflict, what is our duty to our own people and what is the responsibility of our Nation, if any, to the nations of the world? To me the answer to the first question is not difficult. I believe it is our solemn duty to provide for our own people such an adequate national defense that all fear of possible aggression will be dispelled from their minds and that they will be secure in their persons and property. This, I believe is the primary function of government. If it is not discharged, a government has no claim to loyalty nor support from its people. No one dare deny that the first obligation placed upon the Federal Government by the Constitution is to provide for the national defense. To this obligation, I am pledged unreservedly.

The second question, namely, the responsibility which is ours as a Nation is a more serious problem. Have we any duty to perform in this field? Can we be unmindful of the disturbed conditions prevailing throughout the world today and depend upon our isolation or upon legislation to insure us against possible involvement?

During the years following the World War, America brought a real contribution to the cause of world peace. Our people have supported consistently and enthusiastically the sincere and genuine efforts which this Nation has made to advance the cause of peace among the nations of the world. They approved not only a limitation but also a reduction of armaments and advocated every measure, consistent with our own safety, which might advance in a practical way the amicable adjustment of differences between conflicting interests. I am convinced, Mr. Chairman, that the attitude of our people on this matter remains constant. We cherish peace. We abhor war. As a nation we have not surrendered our hopes for peace.

It should be remembered, however, that peace is not a permanent possession, the continuity of which can be assured either by supplication, wishful thinking, or idealistic dreams. Peace is a very practical thing, and its continued possession presents a very practical problem. Peace depends upon restraining many of the natural tendencies of men and nations—the tendency to be assertive, to be acquisitive, to be combative, to be ambitious, to be authoritative. Unrestrained, these tendencies lead to discord, strife, and conflict; and only in the measure by which they are held in check or subordinated to nobler aims can peace prevail among the peoples and the nations of the world. I believe, Mr. Chairman, that an adequate national-defense program on the part of this Nation may serve as an effective check on some nations, at least. I believe, if we want peace, we must strive for it by commanding respect at home and abroad.

The maintenance of peace is as rigorous in its demands as the successful prosecution of war. Catch phrases, silly slogans, or even legislative enactment will not guarantee peace; nor can one nation by the loftiness of its ideals and the nobleness of its purposes compel others to continue at peace; and so long as others refuse to pursue a course which we exemplified by practical performance, we must adapt our program for our own needs and safety. We must be prepared to defend the peace which we so earnestly and devoutly desire. To do otherwise would be worse than folly. It would suggest an attempt at national suicide. This is not the spirit of America. With as much fervor and enthusiasm as it committed itself genuinely and unreservedly to disarmament conferences and put into practice the doctrines of peace which



it preached, our people, aware of the dangerous portents of world affairs, insist today upon an adequate national defense which will protect them from any eventuality and place them beyond the acquisitive ambitions of any aggressor. Any other course would encourage the contempt, the scorn, and the possible attack of those nations which seek to plunge the world into another conflict.

The needs of the Navy can be divided into two general categories, men and materials. I repeat today what I have said on other occasions, that men mean more than materials; that a contented, fearless, and ambitious personnel is of more importance than the type or size of the units of the fleet; and that the development of a personnel of this character is our first duty. Any factor, whether it be a legislative enactment or an administrative policy, which has a demoralizing effect upon the morale of the men should receive the prompt attention of the Congress and be corrected forthwith. The present selection system is such a factor. It is the system by which highly trained officers with extended experience and with not even the suspicion of a blemish on their records, are branded in the prime of life as unfit for service and involuntarily dismissed. It is the system by which every younger officer in the Navy is made the potential victim of the personal pique and spleen of his superiors, or else assume the distasteful and obnoxious role of a patronizing "yes man." It is the system which functions upon only one base and that is favoritism, and which has but one excuse for its existence, and that is favoritism. It is the fetish which is fondled by favorites and worshipped by the fortunates. It gnaws away at the very vitals of the morale of the men, sapping their initiative, their independence, their forthrightness, their ambition, and robbing them of the valiant virtues upon which the best and the finest traditions of the Navy are founded. This slaughter of our own men must be stopped! Why build ships and at the same time kill off the men who are to command these ships? The first duty of the Department is to advocate a change in this indefensible system of selection in which its acknowledges there is need for correction. Thus far it has done nothing, and I predict it will do nothing as long as the Congress permits it to continue on its present course.

New construction is provided for under this bill and it is understood generally that additional construction will be requested by the President. The naval strength which we are building and which must be maintained hereafter should never indicate to other nations that we assume an aggressor attitude. It must be maintained only as the first arm of our national defense. Of necessity it must be proportionate to the type and size and effectiveness of other nations whose altruistic aims have not been assertive and whose peaceful purposes have not been demonstrated clearly and convincingly. Our needs are relative. What other nations do to disturb the peace we must do to maintain our peace and insure our safety.

Nevertheless there presses upon us in the Congress certain questions with the insistence of millions of voices of citizens—it might be truthfully said of all citizens—and those questions should be answered.

There are many citizens who believe that peace for the United States is to be achieved only by isolating ourselves from the dangerous and conflict-breeding affairs of all foreign nations. Those citizens are again divided into two groups, those who believe that an amply adequate national defense will deter any other nations from aggressions against us and those who believe that a race of armaments in which the United States is participating will inevitably lead to a war in which we will be involved.

Another large group of our citizens believe that it is no longer possible for us to isolate ourselves from the dangers and the disputes of a highly integrated world, and that the best assurance of peace is to be found in alliances with certain foreign nations for the purpose of restraining, by whatever necessary concert of action, those aggressor nations which seem bent upon disturbing the peace of the world and the despoilation of weaker nations.

Our citizens are a unit in two deeply based desires. One is that they do not want to be helpless in the face of possible aggressions against us, and the other is that they do not want this Nation involved in any foreign conflict if there is any possible way to avoid it.

These considerations involve four broad questions in this matter now before us. The country awaits an answer.

First. Is the proposed increase in our Navy for the purpose of national defense?

Second. Is that naval increase for the purpose of co-operating with other nations in "quarantining" aggressor nations?

Third. Is this naval increase a reemployment project?

Fourth. Is it a combination of two or of the three purposes just mentioned?

The President has not made clear to the Congress or to the country just what he meant in his Chicago speech advocating "quarantining" of the aggressor nations. He has not made clear to the Congress or to the country how far he means to go in such a policy, or when he intends to move, in concert with other nations, in that plan—if plan there is. What is our foreign policy? To what extent are we going to cooperate with other nations in any forcible or in any threat of forcible restraint of the "aggressor nations"? To what extent are we going to enter the League of Nations by the back door and undertake with other nations to police the world with armed force?

These are the logical, natural, and fair questions which occupy the minds and the apprehensions of the people.

These are the questions which concern us in the Congress, because after all we are still the branch of the Government which must decide whether or not we shall engage in war.

These are questions to which it seems there should be some answer to be given us and to be given the millions of people whose very lives and welfare depend upon the answers.

If this naval expansion is a reemployment project, then it becomes a question of proper and earnest investigation and debate as to whether it is the best sort of reemployment project that can be engaged in at this time.

Would it, as a reemployment project, spread purchasing power to the consumer classes, the wage earners, in as great a quantity and as rapidly as some other public projects?

Would some other reemployment project be more feasible from the standpoint of future maintenance?

Again the question recurs, Where are we going?

If this proposed naval expansion is a combination of national-defense needs and reemployment needs, to what extent does it represent the one and how much of it represents the other? The country should know. The people are entitled to know.

The answer to these questions, it would seem to reasonable men, should be given to the taxpayers—to the fathers and mothers of America whose sons and daughters inevitably will be involved in those answers—regardless of what they are.

To answer these questions should cause no embarrassment to the President and to our State Department, if they have gone no farther in alliances with and commitments to foreign nations than we have thus far been led to believe they have.

Again, as a nation, we raise our voice to the throne of Heaven that a blessing may rest upon us as a people in our endeavor for peace. [Applause.]

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DITTER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The gentleman from Pennsylvania in his very able address propounded a question as to what was the objective in increasing the Navy. Does not the gentleman answer this question in his own language when he states he advocates a navy second to none?

Mr. DITTER. No; I believe not. I believe that since the President has seen fit to call the distinguished gentleman from Georgia and others of his party into conference, there may be more than has been given to the rest of us in the way

of information regarding what the program of the administration is. All I can presently base my assumption on is the limited information as to the policy of the administration, if there is a foreign policy, which has been given to us during the course of the hearings on this bill. The witnesses who appeared before the committee knew nothing, or at least were not willing to divulge any information on the foreign policy and naval policy related thereto of this administration. I know of no member of the minority who was called into the conference with the President when this extended naval construction program was presented, and I know of no member of the majority who seems to know and is free to tell the country what our foreign policy is or the real purpose of this extended naval construction program.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I have such admiration for the sincerity and ability of the gentleman who is in charge of the subcommittee on naval appropriations that I am generally inclined to follow his leadership without bothering about the details of the bill or trying to find fault here or there with some of the small items which may have crept into the bill. There is no abler, more industrious, or more sincere Member of the House than the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. UMSTEAD]. [Applause.] I do not mind saying this in the House or even in his district, where I expect to speak on February 12. I am willing in this instance, with not too much research, to follow the gentleman on this bill and vote for it as a part of our national-defense program, proposed not this year but a number of years ago. I do not recall whether it is a 3-, 4-, or 5-year plan, but it is a part of a previous plan for adequate national defense, and is intended to keep us up as near as possible to the 5-5-3 ratio which expired in 1936.

I preface my remarks with this statement on national defense because for the first time in the 18 years I have been a Member of the House I do not believe I shall be able to follow another program which may come in here this week from the President, asking for additional hundreds of millions of dollars to further increase our Navy. I know when the gentleman from North Carolina gave consideration in his committee to this bill he believed all the money carried herein is necessary for adequate national defense, or he would not have brought in the bill. If he believed more was necessary, he would have asked for more and, vice versa, if he believed less necessary, he would have cut it down. I am ready to follow him on this particular naval building program, but I demand of the Republicans and of the Democrats alike that if the President comes in with another bill, asking for \$200,000,000 more, that we turn the searchlight of pitiless publicity on it and try to find out the reasons and motives behind it, and why it is necessary to go into this mad competition of building superdreadnaughts at \$70,000,000 apiece.

Where is the leadership in this world? Where is the statesmanship? Is it all bankrupt? Why are we forced to vote for these hundreds of millions of dollars for more and bigger ships with an unbalanced Budget, with 11,000,000 unemployed, and in the midst of a depression? Millions of people in this country will want to know where they are going to get relief and necessities of life and who is going to feed them? How long can this madness, this naval rivalry, continue without an explosion? Have we no leadership or statesmanship in America? Have we gone mad like the rest and has reason disappeared from the face of the earth so that people and nations must drift helplessly into universal ruin and disaster? Is war and preparedness for war the solution of our problems? Every thinking American knows that war is mass suicide and that even the victor loses. I have voted consistently for adequate national defense, but I do not propose to vote a dollar for aggression or purposes of offense. Where is the leadership for peace? This naval rivalry is the road to war all over the world. What are we doing? We are following the warlike leadership of fascism and nazi-ism and of the great military and naval powers into a naval race.

And now, if you will permit me, I want to be partisan a minute, just to be natural. Who is responsible? Who is to blame for the situation with which the Congress is confronted when we are forced to vote upon this program of \$500,000,000 or more, and then probably at the end of the week, be called upon for \$200,000,000 in addition, but the President of the United States—and I say this advisedly—not intimating he does not believe in peace or that he is an advocate of war, but I believe I am fair when I say that the responsibility rests upon the President for this naval program, for this naval rivalry and competition with England and Japan.

Back in 1921 and 1922, under the leadership of Secretary of State Charles E. Hughes, we called a conference of the great naval powers here in Washington. We got them around the table and finally we agreed with Japan and England upon a so-called 5-5-3 ratio. For the first time in history Great Britain, who had ruled the waves for hundreds of years, agreed to equality with the United States and Japan and accepted the three ratios; then that treaty was agreed to. In spite of what the supermilitarists, the "jingoes," and the armament propagandists said about Mr. Hughes—that he had sacrificed the Navy and betrayed America—I say to you that limitation-of-armament agreement was the greatest step for peace and good will the world has seen in our day and generation. Overnight all thought of war and talk of war between this country and Japan and Great Britain and other countries disappeared. The "jingoes" were forced to stop talking because there was a definite agreement to reduce the navies to 18 ships for Great Britain, 18 for ourselves, and 10 for Japan. This was under a Republican administration back in 1922. Every nation kept this treaty and every part of the treaty, and we saved \$250,000,000 a year on our naval building program, and in the 16 years it was in effect we saved \$4,000,000,000 of the taxpayers' money. This may not seem much to this administration, but that is only the intrinsic part of it. I am concerned with the problem of peace. It produced peaceful relations between Japan and ourselves and Great Britain, but now this has all been scrapped, and we are again embarked in a dangerous and costly naval race with Japan and Great Britain.

In 1930 under a Republican administration we extended the 5-5-3 ratio to small ships under 10,000 tons, to light cruisers, to submarines, to destroyers, and so on, but in 1936, at the end of that year, when this naval limitation agreement expired, nothing replaced it. Now, after 5 years of this administration, which was elected more or less on a program of peace, we are launched on a naval competition program, spending hundreds of millions of dollars for destructive purposes because this administration failed to come to any agreement with Great Britain and Japan to extend the Washington treaty and let it expire after 15 years of trial, in which it had proved its worth in terms of peace and good will and saved the taxpayers \$4,000,000,000.

These are the facts, and they are undeniable. This is why I say the blame and the responsibility for the situation we are in is on this administration, and this administration alone. Why did they fall down? Because they went into the conference to renew this treaty with their hands tied behind them. They let the admirals and the big Navy men represent us at these conferences. I commended the President and the Secretary of State only a few weeks ago for the peaceful settlement growing out of the *Panay* incident; but what I regret more than anything else is that this administration has permitted and deliberately injected partisanship into the conduct of our foreign affairs.

For the first time since the foundation of our Republic the committees and commissions that go to deal with foreign countries on the question of peace or disarmament have been entirely made up of members from one party, and the minority party has not had a single representative. When we put through the treaty of Washington in 1922 the leading members of the Democratic Party were on the commission. I believe that Senator Robinson and Senator Underwood and others represented the Democratic Party at that peace conference.



Our traditional American policy of keeping partisan politics out of the consideration of international issues involving the peace of our country has not only been ignored but deliberately scrapped by President Roosevelt. He has in his autocratic and high-handed manner started a most unfortunate precedent that will come home to plague both parties, but, far more important, the interests of our country.

But in none of the peace conferences or those on armament has there been any representation of the Republican Party under this administration. It is often difficult for us to speak on the issue, because there is no one to advise us. We cannot get the facts. We do not know what went on behind the scenes, we do not know where to go unless we go to prejudiced sources. The fact is that now, due to the failure to renew these peace agreements on naval armament, we are launched into a competition with Japan and Great Britain, and everybody in the country, regardless of party, knows that naval competition is the road to war. It produces hatred, suspicion, and hostility and eventuates in war. That is the program that we are launched on, against our will. We are helpless in the House. I shall vote for this bill providing \$500,000,000 for our Navy, because I believe, with the chairman, that we should keep at least 30 percent ahead of Japan, and as I see it that is exactly what this bill does. But I shall need a lot more information before I shall vote for any more millions to give us the biggest navy in the world. Either our Navy is for defense or it is for aggression, and I want to find out which it is. I want to vote for an adequate Navy for defense and not for aggression and offense.

For example, I shall give the House some figures that are almost inconceivable. It will be hard for gentlemen to believe them. Back in 1916 when this country was just as rich as it is today, and possibly richer, because we did not have a national debt of forty billions, we had a debt of only one billion, our total appropriations for the year, including national defense, the running expenses of the Government and everything else, amounted to \$678,000,000.

That was just a year before we went into the World War. Our total appropriations amounted to \$678,000,000 and that included an appropriation for the Navy of \$149,000,000. And here we are today voting for over \$500,000,000 for the Navy alone, and with the Army appropriations it will be over a billion dollars, and the President has not yet submitted his estimates for the additional Navy that he proposes. I assume that the appropriations for national defense this year for the most peaceful and peace-loving nation in the world will be double the entire Federal expenditures in 1916. This country, as far as I know, is absolutely immune from attack from any foreign foe, and I challenge in his time any Member of Congress, any general in the Army, any admiral in the Navy, to show wherein any nation in the world would even dare to attempt to land soldiers in the United States. Nevertheless we are voting today and later on for an Army and Navy at a cost of probably over \$1,200,000,000. That is twice the total appropriation for everything in 1916. How long can we continue spending such vast sums on preparedness for war? Instead of voting for these large sums for destructive purposes, there ought to be an international conference to limit naval armament, and it ought to be called immediately by President Roosevelt. I want the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. UMSTEAD] to cooperate with me, and I think he will, and urge the President, or at least express the will of Congress to the President that we are behind him and insist that he call a naval conference with Great Britain, Japan, and us, and in addition, if necessary, Italy and France, to limit naval armaments.

Mr. SHANLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. Yes.

Mr. SHANLEY. Does the gentleman think Japan would go into any conference unless we gave her parity?

Mr. FISH. I am very glad the gentleman asked that question and I shall answer the gentleman in a moment. First, I am led to believe from statements made within the last year by the man who is now the Prime Minister of Great Britain, Mr. Chamberlain, that he would welcome such a con-

ference, and why not? The head of the Japanese Navy Department made a similar statement. In answer to the specific question, when we went into the conference that failed, these admirals of ours, as I understand it, and our big Navy men, would not make any effective concessions to Japan. They insisted on the 5-5-3 or 3½ ratio. I say to the gentleman from Connecticut, and I have given it a good deal of thought, I am willing to make it 5-5-4 for Japan, and if we would make it on that basis, we would have reached an agreement with Japan overnight, and stopped spending these billions of dollars for unnecessary naval construction when we need that money for purposes of peace in our own country. Does not the gentleman know that Japan needs money more than we do? Does he not know that we are still the richest Nation in the world? It is much harder for Japan to build than it is for us and naturally they would like to reach such an agreement. We could have that agreement under this administration, but you first have to make the offer. The President must call the conference; it is not too late to save us from entering into this naval competition with the rest of the world.

Mr. SHANLEY. As I remember the 1936 conference, Admiral Nogano, acting for Japan, dogmatically insisted on a parity basis, and that is the reason they bolted the conference.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Connecticut, I think, knows international affairs probably as well as anybody in the House. He is a great student of it and of international law. Naturally, when you go into a conference you ask more than you expect, and the Japanese naturally started in with a demand for equality, but, from what I can understand and hear, they would be more than willing to go back to their country and say, "We have refused to agree to a 5-5-3 ratio, but we are bringing home to you a 5-5-4 ratio," and Japan would be more than satisfied, because it is more difficult for them, with their limited income, to pay these millions and hundreds of millions of dollars in competition with us.

Mr. SHANLEY. The unfortunate answer to that is they failed to reduce.

Mr. FISH. That is not the fact at all.

Mr. SHANLEY. I think the gentleman will find that it is.

Mr. FISH. No, no; I am not ready to concede that. Whether you are right or whether I am right, we cannot convince ourselves. We should have a conference right away, right now. Can the gentleman see any objection to it? I know the gentleman is for peace, and I know he is a great student of international conferences.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Has the gentleman from New York any real faith or confidence in these international agreements?

Mr. FISH. I have absolute faith in agreements of that kind, such as the limitation of naval armaments, because they were absolutely lived up to by the five countries concerned. All the signatory countries lived up to them. I would not place too much confidence in some other kind of agreements, such, for instance, as one that affects the immediate defense of a country, or one binding Japan to get out of Manchuria.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Is it not true that the agreement that was lived up to before existed during a time when there was more peace in the world than there is today?

Mr. FISH. No.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Does the gentleman think that any agreement made by the various countries he has named could be lived up to in the next few years?

Mr. FISH. It has been lived up to. The gentleman was not in Congress at that time. At that time we were launched on a stupendous naval program which was as big as the one we are now proposing. All the nations of the world were in the same situation, and Great Britain and Japan knew that we meant business. In view of the fact that we succeeded in stopping it then, we can do it today just as easily, because we

have had that experience; and I submit there is absolutely nothing in the world to stop it except the willingness of our President to lead the way and call such a conference. The only way to do it is to try it out. Is there any sound reason why we should not try it out? Is the gentleman or any other member of the Republican Party satisfied with voting these hundreds of millions for the Navy, when we might go into a conference and reduce them by half? I am not satisfied with even 18 battleships; I would like to see us go into a conference and reduce them to 10 for Great Britain and ourselves and 6 or 7 for Japan. Then we would have the same relative national defense.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. A little while ago the gentleman said that the total appropriations for the year 1916 were six hundred and some-odd millions of dollars.

Mr. FISH. I did.

Mr. McCORMACK. I just had occasion to inquire and I learned that the total appropriations for the fiscal year 1916 were \$1,114,490,704.09.

Mr. FISH. The gentleman has probably got the wrong fiscal year.

Mr. McCORMACK. No; it is the fiscal year 1916. I just got these figures from the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. FISH. All right; we will not argue about it. The gentleman has the war year, the appropriations for the next fiscal year.

Mr. McCORMACK. The appropriations for the year before, the 1915 fiscal year, were \$1,122,491,919.12.

Mr. FISH. I took my figures out of the World Almanac today. There can be no question about them, because not only were the figures for the year before practically the same, but, furthermore, back in 1908 was the first billion-dollar Congress. That is, Congress spent \$1,000,000,000 in 2 years; \$500,000,000 a year.

Mr. McCORMACK. If these figures are right, then the gentleman is about 50 percent wrong.

Mr. FISH. No; I am not wrong at all. The gentleman has a right to his figures. My figures were taken from the World Almanac.

Mr. McCORMACK. Would not the gentleman take in preference the figures of our own Committee on Appropriations, the figures of the official record of our own committee in preference to the figures given in the World Almanac?

Mr. FISH. The year we went into the World War the appropriations jumped very materially. The gentleman is probably talking about the fiscal year we went into the World War. The actual Federal income for 1916 was only \$782,000,000 and we spent much less.

Mr. McCORMACK. Fiscal year, or calendar year, we appropriate for a 12 months' period. We appropriate for the fiscal year.

Mr. FISH. But we appropriate for the coming fiscal year. The gentleman probably took the wrong fiscal year.

Mr. McCORMACK. No. The year starts on July 1 and ends the following June 30.

Mr. FISH. I am not willing to admit that the World Almanac is inaccurate as far as expenditures for 1916 are concerned. All the gentleman has to do is to locate those figures.

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. HEALEY. Was there any limitation of time on the naval treaty between the three powers—England, Japan, and the United States?

Mr. FISH. Yes; 15 years.

Mr. HEALEY. The gentleman says this treaty was kept for 15 years?

Mr. FISH. It was kept so far as battleships were concerned. It applied only to those war vessels over 10,000 tons. It expired at the end of 1936.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The whole treaty expired in 1936.

Mr. FISH. Yes; but the treaty was amended in 1930 to include cruisers and warships under 10,000 tons. That was the London Treaty of 1930, and that has likewise expired. So we have nothing today; and my complaint is that this naval pace is unnecessary and will eventuate in war.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The gentleman is in error, because we do have a treaty with England with reference to certain categories, that Japan refused to sign, in reference to the size of battleships, limiting them to 35,000 tons. Japan today, so the press says, is laying down a 45,000-ton battleship.

Mr. FISH. The gentleman from Georgia says that Japan is laying down a 45,000-ton battleship, probably with 18-inch guns.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. So the press says.

Mr. FISH. That may be so and may not be. It might also include 18-inch guns. That is what we are getting into. If Japan does that, we have to follow her example.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Is that not just as reliable as the World Almanac?

Mr. FISH. No. If the gentleman told me that was an A. P. report, I would say I believed him. However, this is probably what will happen: In a year or so Japan will build a battleship of 45,000 tons, with 18-inch guns; then we will have to follow suit, and instead of building battleships costing \$70,000,000 they will cost over \$100,000,000 a piece.

I tried out a test today on several intelligent people who came into my office. I asked them, "How much do you think a battleship costs these days?" I asked two of them that question. One said \$20,000,000 and the other said \$25,000,000. That is what the people back home think. But actually in this bill we are providing for two battleships at \$70,000,000 a piece. Now, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], who is an expert on naval affairs, and one of the able Members of this House, intimates that we will probably have to pay more because Japan possibly will build bigger battleships. That is what we want to prevent. I want to bring about a conference to prevent that very thing, to stop this competition with Japan and Great Britain, and, if possible, to reduce the number of battleships and the size of battleships, and we would have exactly the same national defense. We could probably save two or three hundred million dollars a year, as we did in 1922, promote peaceful relations, and have adequate national defense.

Mr. KITCHENS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. KITCHENS. I understood the gentleman to say if we could have a new conference he would be willing to go so far as to make the ratio 5-5-4?

Mr. FISH. That is right.

Mr. KITCHENS. If it was necessary to bring about a peaceful situation, would the gentleman be willing to go as far as 5-5-5, thereby equalize the situation with these other nations and avoid these distinctions?

Mr. FISH. I will answer the gentleman, and I may shock other Members of the House in doing so. I would be perfectly willing to go that far. I would be perfectly willing to have Japan have a navy equal to ours because I believe when I vote for our Navy it is for the purpose of defense, and if we have a Navy equal to Japan we will never have any trouble with Japan due to the fact no Navy can come 10,000 miles across the sea to attack us if we have a Navy as large as hers. However, I believe that Japan would be satisfied with a 5-5-4 ratio.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Does the gentleman know of anything in world affairs today which would make it either difficult or impossible to hold a conference such as he suggests be called in order to see whether his object would be attained?



Mr. FISH. I know of absolutely nothing to hinder it. I believe it would be welcomed by the American people and that Great Britain and Japan would jump at the chance to have a new conference. They have more at stake than we have. I propose to offer such an amendment to the pending bill. It may not be germane. I would be glad to have the gentleman who is head of the subcommittee on naval affairs appropriations offer it in my place. The amendment reads that the President is authorized and requested to invite such governments as he may deem necessary or expedient to send representatives to a conference at Washington or elsewhere for the purpose of entering into agreements for the limitation of naval armaments.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. UMSTEAD. I take it the gentleman from New York has forgotten that last year when this bill was under consideration I offered such an amendment. The amendment was not ruled out on a point of order but was defeated in committee.

Mr. FISH. It was defeated by a very few votes. The gentleman will remember I first spoke about it on the floor of the House. I urged him to offer the amendment, which was defeated by a few votes. I regret I was not here at the time to vote for the amendment, but if he will bring it up again I will be here and not only will work for the amendment but will vote for it, because I think it is the best thing that can be done at the present time.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. In the 5-5-3 agreement between Great Britain and the United States, how many actual ships did Great Britain destroy, and how many actual ships did we destroy?

Mr. FISH. I imagine that we destroyed more partly built ships or older ships than Great Britain or Japan.

Mr. STEFAN. Did Great Britain destroy any ships?

Mr. FISH. I believe so. I have confidence in Secretary Hughes, and the results prove he was right. There were all kinds of propaganda that we sank ships and nobody else sank any, and for years Mr. Hughes was berated as betraying the country; but the results proved a benefit to our country, to our taxpayers, and to peace. I wish to God we might have the same kind of conference and would sink some more ships, perhaps half of our Navy, if the rest will sink half of theirs.

Mr. STEFAN. If the gentleman carried out his plan, we would be up against the proposition of destroying more ships. Then why appropriate more money for new ships?

Mr. FISH. I am perfectly willing to appropriate money and let these nations know that we are going ahead to build more ships unless they enter into this conference with us.

Mr. STEFAN. But that would result again in the United States destroying actual ships costing millions of dollars and, on the other hand, Great Britain would destroy nothing but paper and blueprints.

Mr. FISH. The gentleman knows that it will take several years to build the ships provided for in this bill, but let me tell the gentleman, as a result of our sinking our ships we saved \$250,000,000 a year for 15 years. You have to provide for every battleship you build. It will cost several million dollars a year to maintain each one. You cannot help saving money, whether we sink ships or whether we do not.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Is it not true also that because we saved so much money at that time we have to spend so much more today to rebuild our Navy?

Mr. FISH. No; not at all. If the gentleman means we are richer than any other nation and can spend a billion dollars to their \$100,000,000, the gentleman is correct, if that is the attitude of the gentleman. That is the attitude of a great many people who have navy yards in their districts, and it is the attitude of the supermilitarists. We could re-

duce our Navy in half if the other big-navy nations would do the same and have ample national defense.

What is the policy of this country? Is this Navy for defense or is it for aggression? I have not heard any Democrat or anyone else say what the policy of the United States is. What is our policy?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. What is the opinion of the gentleman from New York? Will not the gentleman give the committee the benefit of his opinion, instead of inquiring of us? What is the gentleman's opinion on whether the Navy is for offensive or defensive purposes?

Mr. FISH. I am a complete outsider. The gentleman is the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, which draws up the policies and the naval program. Congress, not the President, has the constitutional duty to maintain and provide a Navy. It is the duty of the gentleman and the gentleman's committee to say what the policy is, and nobody has explained the naval policy of the United States. As a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I would like to know what the naval policy is in connection with international issues.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. Would it not seem the administration would take Congress into its confidence and tell us why it is asking for these tremendous sums of money?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. Yes.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The gentleman says he is an outsider. I may say to the gentleman there was no need for him to make such a statement, because the House is of that opinion, judging from his remarks.

Mr. FISH. The gentleman, as a big-navy man, speaks for himself but not for the House. The gentleman has failed to present to the Congress any policy at all. All the President asks for is appropriations, and we want to know, and insist on knowing, what the naval policy of the administration is. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my rising is not so much to clarify the confusing argument of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] but to say the appropriation carried in this bill is the result of a definite and fixed policy resulting from the Washington and the London Conferences and the London Conference of 1936. The gentleman is somewhat confused. I said to him in all charity there was no need for him to state he was an "outsider on matters of this kind," because his argument was so inaccurate anyone who is familiar with the subject was aware of the fact he was an outsider.

No administration in the history of this country has ever done more to limit naval armaments than the present administration. A delegation headed by distinguished citizens and naval experts went to London and did everything humanly possible to bring about a satisfactory treaty with reference to the limitation of armaments. As far as I am concerned, and I know as far as the average Member of this House is concerned, we would welcome the day when naval armaments, not only in America but throughout the whole civilized world, would be materially reduced. As far as I am concerned, there is no desire that this Government participate in a naval race. For 15 long years we refused to build, hoping disarmament by example might be contagious throughout the world. What was the result? The other countries signatory to the treaties promptly commenced to build up their navies, until they placed the United States at a great disadvantage in its defense.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I desire to commend the gentleman from North Carolina on the able manner in which he has presented the naval appropriation bill to this House.

I have not, during my years of service in this House, heard as fine a presentation of a naval appropriation bill as was made by the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. UMSTEAD], the chairman of the subcommittee.

This Congress and the people of the United States are to be congratulated on having the needs for this branch of our national defense forces in the hands of such an able statesman.

I also wholeheartedly concur in the fine tribute paid by the gentlemen from North Carolina to his able clerk, Mr. Pugh.

On yesterday the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee referred to with much apprehension the year-by-year increased appropriation that is carried to pay officers and enlisted men that are upon the retired lists.

He called the attention of the committee to the fact that in 1933 the appropriation was \$22,000,000 and that for the fiscal year 1939 it is \$36,000,000, being an increase of \$14,000,000 in 6 years.

Now I grant that at first blush such an increase might cause some apprehension and alarm. But let us examine how the retired pay is made up and the reason why enlisted men and officers are placed upon the retired list and determine if a different course is justified.

By the act of August 29, 1916, Congress passed a law permitting enlisted men who had served for a period of 16 years to be transferred to the Fleet Naval Reserve.

Let me say that is the largest item of retired pay in the bill. It amounts to \$15,507,347. That is for the 16- and 20-year men. On this list there are 18,189 men.

Under the law men who had served for 16 years were eligible to transfer to the Fleet Naval Reserve.

The act of 1916 was repealed by the act of February 28, 1925, which provided that no enlisted man could transfer to the Fleet Naval Reserve after July 1, 1925, until he had at least 20 years in the Navy.

Now, what was the motive and what prompted Congress to enact the acts of 1916 and 1925; that is, to transfer enlisted men to the Fleet Naval Reserve after serving 16 and 20 years?

First. The reason behind the enactment of this legislation was the difficulty of retaining men in the Regular Service for more than one or two enlistments.

Second. To provide trained personnel in the Reserve immediately available for a greatly expanded Navy in time of emergency.

Third. The Fleet Naval Reserve forms a reserve of trained men immediately available to the Navy in time of mobilization, and hence the Navy is able to operate in peacetime with allowances for the ships somewhat less than the number necessary to man them for wartime service. Should this Fleet Naval Reserve be abolished, it would be necessary to increase the allowances of all ships in the Regular Navy to provide the number of enlisted men who would be called upon as nucleus crews to man vessels taken over by the Navy in time of emergency and for gun crews of merchant vessels on such occasions.

If Congress should repeal the act of February 28, 1925, providing for the transfer of enlisted men to the Fleet Naval Reserve, the very first thing it would be necessary to do would be to increase the complements of the ships, and that would cost a great deal more than it is costing today.

It would mean that you would have to enlist men and keep them on the ships, for you would have no Reserve to draw from in case of national emergency, and it would be far more expensive than to have a reserve as now provided for by transferring men to the Fleet Naval Reserve.

In addition thereto, you would have to increase your training stations to care for a constant turn-over of enlisted personnel.

There would be no inducement for an enlisted man to reenlist, and after his termination of one enlistment he would go out and new recruits would have to be trained to take their place.

As a result today of the act of 1925, from 70 to 80 percent of the personnel reenlists, and every time a man reenlists it not only reduces the cost of the training establishment but it also increases the efficiency of the Navy.

Now, what happened during the World War? We did not have a large Naval Reserve. We had no nucleus to draw from, so the result was that the trained personnel had to be taken from the battleships and put upon auxiliary cruisers and merchant ships to man the guns placed thereon, and this resulted in a reduction of the efficiency of the battle fleet and for the time being the battleships were forced to be placed in the York River while new crews were being trained thereon.

It is absolutely essential that there be a pool of experienced men trained in the fleet under the immediate control of the Navy Department and that are also available for mobilization purposes.

With the complexity of modern installation, the necessity for trained men aboard ship is greater than ever before.

A man-of-war man cannot be made overnight nor fully trained for the more responsible duties in one enlistment.

Reenlisted men are the backbone of the fleet. I repeat it is essential for the efficiency of the Navy that there be reenlistments, and a transfer to the Fleet Naval Reserve with certain pay after a service of 20 years offers an inducement to the enlisted man to continue to reenlist.

There can be no doubt that the present system of retirement is in the interest of efficiency and economy. It would be false economy to do away with this method of retirement. It would cost far more and would jeopardize the efficiency of the Navy to let men go out at the expiration of one enlistment.

The item in the appropriation bill, "Pay and allowances of transfer and assignment of men to the Fleet Naval Reserve", which amounts to \$15,507,347, goes to the enlisted men who have served from 16 to 20 years in the Navy. I repeat they constitute a naval reserve which in case of national emergency the Navy can draw from. There are 18,189 men in this group. The law requires them to be ever ready for service at the call of the Navy.

The next item in the bill for retired men is for the pay of enlisted men on the retired list which amounts to \$8,599,950. Now this goes to men who have served for 30 continuous years in the Navy. They are approximately 50 or 52 years of age when they go on the retired list.

The best days of their life have been given to their country both in time of peace and in war.

Bear in mind that they are not officers. They are enlisted men who have served with honorable records for 30 years.

They too are eligible, if physically qualified, for call back to duty in the event of national emergency. These enlisted men, cannot after serving 30 years in the Navy go out in civil life at their age and commence life anew.

It is nothing but right and proper that the Government should compensate them in some manner for their long, faithful service.

The benefits of retirement are taken into consideration in all legislation in fixing their pay on active duty.

I submit that no economy can be brought about by eliminating this item, for in turn it would force higher active pay.

The next item is for officers on the retired list, amounting to \$9,414,000.

On this list there are 2,510 commissioned officers and 642 warrant officers, making a total of 3,152 commissioned and warrant officers on the retired list of the United States Navy.

Officers are placed upon the retired list in accordance with various laws enacted by Congress. Five hundred and seventy-one officers on the retired list are there as a result of the selection law. Eight hundred and eighty-nine officers are on the retired list as a result of voluntary retirement after having served 30 or 40 years in the Navy. One thousand five hundred and seventy-four are placed on the retired list on account of their physical conditions. One hundred and fourteen officers are placed on the retired list who have reached the statutory age of 64 years.



To recapitulate, there are 7,432 30-year enlisted men on the retired list; 18,189 16- and 20-year men on the retired list; and 3,152 commissioned and warrant officers on the list, or a total of 28,773.

Of this number only 571, or less than 2 percent, are on the retired list as a result of the selection law.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN. Is it mandatory for the enlisted man to leave the Navy after he has served 30 years?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I would say yes.

Mr. COCHRAN. And they enlist men in the Navy at the age of 18?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. COCHRAN. Therefore, a man who goes in the Navy at 18 and remains in the Navy for 30 years is 48 years of age when he has served 30 years.

Does the gentleman contend that a man physically and mentally sound at the age of 48 who desires to remain in the Navy should be required to go on the retired list?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I may have been inaccurate when I said that it is mandatory for him to get out. It may not be mandatory, but his usefulness is somewhat impaired, because he is 51 or 52 years of age, and he has served as an enlisted man for some 30 years. He goes out, but he is subject to the call of his Government in case of a national emergency.

Mr. COCHRAN. I would like to know whether or not the usefulness of the gentleman himself was impaired when he reached the age of 48?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. But I would say that as a sailor I would not be as useful at 48 as I would be at 25.

Mr. COCHRAN. And as a Congressman?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Oh, he is more useful, because he has absorbed a great deal from experience and also from age.

Mr. COCHRAN. I think it is the same with the enlisted man as it is with the Congressman.

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. CULKIN. A Congressman's status is purely mental, I assume.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Certainly.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Certainly.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Does the gentleman feel that it is good policy to permit anyone to retire from the Navy at 38 or even at 48 and then be permitted to go out and compete in industry and in many instances be given a preference over the average civilian?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. If a man has not military usefulness, it is false economy for the Government to keep him in the military service, and there is no justification for it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The gentleman well knows there are thousands of enlisted men who enlist at 18 years of age, with the consent of their parents, and then at the age of 38 they are permitted to retire.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. And receive retired pay while competing in industry with other people.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. He receives retired pay.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Does the gentleman approve of that policy?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes; for two reasons. It is in the interest of economy to do it, because you have to have a pool, a reserve, to draw from in case of national emergency, and if you do not offer them some inducement to reenlist they would leave the service, and it would cost more to train new men, and your Navy would not be as efficient.

Mr. Chairman, there are only 571 on the retired list as a result of this much-criticized selection law, or less than 2 percent of the retired list in the Navy is due to that law. So I say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania or to any others who seek to point out the great injustice of this selection law,

that as far as figures show it is being administered fairly, and is an equitable law as far as obtaining efficiency in the Navy Service is concerned.

Mr. SMITH of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Connecticut. What is the percentage of retired officers who are retired because of the selection law?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. No officer can be retired by the Selection Board until he has served at least 14 years in the Navy, and he goes out then with an annual pay of \$1,008, and an officer who is retired after serving 14 years has had an opportunity eight different times to have been selected by the Selection Board.

Mr. SMITH of Connecticut. What I want to know for my own information is the approximate percentage of the officers on the retired list who are retired as a result of the selection system.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. About 20 percent, because they have 2,510 officers on the retirement list and 517 are the result of the selection law.

Mr. SCOTT. And it is true, however, that we do retire some officers that are considered capable to fill the positions because there are no positions above them for them to go into.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes. I am very glad my colleague from California called attention to that. The officer strength of the Navy is regulated by law. It is based on an authorized enlisted strength of 137,000 men.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I started this discussion in reference to retired pay of officers and men in the Naval and Military Services. The Budget estimates for the present year provide \$65,909,818 for retired pay for the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Public Health Service, and Coast and Geodetic Survey.

The suggestion I advanced was that in view of the fact we require the civil-service employees to contribute monthly toward a retirement fund, and the workers in industry to contribute to an unemployment fund under the Social Security Act, is it not reasonable to assume that it might be fair to the taxpayers of this country were we to require those in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Public Health Service, and Coast and Geodetic Survey to contribute a little toward a retirement fund? For instance, a major general in the Army retires. His base pay is \$8,000. He gets \$6,000 for the rest of his life, yet he has never contributed a nickel toward the retirement fund.

The gentleman from Georgia has been here 24 years. I have been here, not as a Member of Congress but as a Member and a secretary for more than 24 years. When we go out of Congress we will not get one one-hundredth of 1 percent of our salary as retirement pay. I cannot speak for myself, but I know that the gentleman from Georgia has been a very valuable Member of Congress; and outside of the clerk of the committee, Mr. John Pugh, of whom he speaks so well, I think the gentleman from Georgia and the gentleman from North Carolina, the chairman of this subcommittee [Mr. UMSTEAD], know more about the Navy of the United States than any man in the country.

The cost of retirement is continually increasing. In 1933 retirement in the Navy cost the Government \$22,416,592. In 1939, 6 years afterward, we are asked to appropriate \$36,827,562, or in round numbers a \$14,400,000 increase. If it continues at this rate, within 10 years the cost of retirement for the services I have mentioned will be up around \$100,000,000.

Let nobody tell you that they do not kick this thing around to a certain extent. Men in the Navy 20 years, fully capable of carrying on, are retired. A noncommissioned officer retires at \$137 a month. Within a week or 2 weeks' time after retirement he has another job in public life. I know the case of a man in the Marine Corps who retired after 20 years. Within 2 weeks' time he was work-

ing in another Government agency getting \$150 a month on top of his retired pay. I admit he was a very valuable man. We all remember the case of a very distinguished officer of the Army who retired recently at the age of 56, in perfect physical condition, who gets \$6,000 a year retired pay. Do you think he is going to loaf? Oh, no. Nine out of ten who are not retired for physical disability go to work.

I have suggested, and I suggest again, that it is a matter for the legislative committees in control to consider the advisability of setting up a retirement fund on the basis of contribution by those in the services I have mentioned who are going to benefit. They should be required to contribute something toward that fund as the civil-service employees of the Government and the citizens in private life are required to contribute toward their benefit funds.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], who, as I previously stated, is one of the best-informed men in the country on our Naval Establishment, naturally knows that it is only in time of war that this country required our citizens to enter the military or naval service. In times of peace the enlistment is voluntary. As to the officers the great majority are graduates of West Point and Annapolis. We all know that for every appointment we have to the Military and Naval Academies we have at least a dozen candidates. You likewise know we are besieged by Army and Navy officers to nominate their sons for appointments to the academies. Now, if the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps required a great sacrifice for one to make it their lifetime profession, do you think for a moment those who have been in the service would want their sons to become officers? It costs the Government about \$12,000 to train and educate a cadet at West Point or a midshipman at Annapolis. They receive an education that millions of our young men would be glad to have. Then, when they complete their course, and graduate, they are immediately commissioned, go on the pay roll, and have a lifetime job. When the young man graduates from the private college, he does not go on any pay roll but must look for a job or build up a private practice if he is in the professional class. He pays his own way through college. We should not picture service in the Army and Navy as a hardship, because it is not.

Below will be found some figures taken from the Budget of the cost of the retirement system in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Public Health Service, and Coast and Geodetic Survey:

	1933	1938	1939
<b>NAVY</b>			
Officers.....	\$5,800,410	\$9,000,000	\$9,414,000
Enlisted men.....	4,419,910	7,600,000	8,599,950
Nurses.....	47,641	243,249	271,976
Men transferred to Reserve.....	10,451,941	15,290,000	15,507,347
Officers, Marine Corps.....	749,786	1,425,000	1,706,000
Enlisted marines.....	620,208	841,000	841,000
Marines transferred to Reserve.....	281,696	443,280	487,289
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>22,416,592</b>	<b>34,842,529</b>	<b>36,827,562</b>
<b>ARMY</b>			
Officers.....	9,447,323	12,999,525	13,123,676
Warrant officers.....			
Nurses.....			
Men.....	12,252,603	13,521,730	13,725,080
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>21,699,926</b>	<b>26,521,255</b>	<b>26,848,756</b>
Coast Guard.....			2,000,000
Public Health.....			200,000
Coast and Geodetic Survey.....			33,500
<b>Grand total for 1939.....</b>			<b>65,909,818</b>

You will note the increase from year to year by comparing the 1938 figures for the Army and Navy with the 1939 figures.

Not only should the legislative committees look into this matter, but I also feel that men physically and mentally qualified, regardless of whether they are officers or enlisted men, should be permitted to remain in the Army and Navy after 30 years' service if they so desire. It must be remem-

bered they start their careers at an early age, and many of them have 30 years' service before they reach the half-century mark. The Government should never say that when a man reaches the age of 50, if he is physically and mentally sound that his usefulness, so far as the Army or Navy is concerned, is at an end.

Take a man in the Medical Corps—an enlisted man—who has served 25 or 30 years, he has the practical experience of a doctor. In the Navy a chief pharmacist mate is the doctor on board a destroyer and some other Navy vessels. He treats the men and prescribes for them, as does the medical officer, and it is only when this man is unable to diagnose the case that he sends a message to the medical officer on board some other vessel in the fleet or when the man becomes seriously ill. Why, during the World War chief pharmacist mates acted as medical officers of companies of marines serving at the front. If you do not think that statement is true, check up on it. To put a man out of the service with such training when he has served 30 years should not be permitted, provided the man desires to stay and passes the necessary examination.

The Army or Navy has no better friend in Congress than I have been. My record confirms that statement. Many men in both services have told me there was no sound reason why they should not be required to contribute toward a retirement fund.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER].

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, no greater contradiction and inconsistency has developed in 5 years of the New Deal administration—filled as it is with contradictions—than President Roosevelt's assault on the press of America.

While he constantly insists that he wants to protect and encourage the small community industries, he now assaults, in his campaign against the newspapers and periodicals of America the most widespread, representative, thoroughly American community industries in the entire economic structure of the Nation.

While he constantly insists that his policy is to protect the rights of a free press, he is now assailing that free press.

While he constantly insists that he desires to protect the free expression of every hue and shade of opinion and criticism, he is now assailing in the most dangerous way the very organs of that free opinion and criticism.

Committed as he insistently asserts he is to the policy of lowering the cost of those things the farmers have to buy, he is now moving to increase the cost of one of the most vital necessities of American farmers—the cultural, religious, and class magazines and the general press.

Time and again Mr. Roosevelt has declared he is committed to the policy of carrying to the common people—the submerged one-third, if you please—the information and comment on vital subjects of government, of economics, of sociology, of culture—of all those matters which are of the most importance to them—yet he has now turned his back on all of that and is assailing the very avenues of information and comment which carry to the common people the facts of our national life and of world developments, of culture; and he is endeavoring to increase to them—the poor people—the cost of securing that information and comment.

The unvarying theme of Mr. Roosevelt's appeals to the masses is that he wants to secure for the underprivileged, the poorer classes, "a more abundant life." Well, Mr. Chairman, one of the greatest elements of a more abundant life is current literature. It is the religious, the cultural, the informative, and the analytical press of America. Yet, Mr. Roosevelt now moves to increase the cost, to those submerged and poorer classes, of procuring the benefits and the pleasures of the religious, the cultural, the informative, and the analytical literature which means so much to them. It is not the wealthy or the financially more fortunate classes who will feel the blow of an increased cost of newspapers and periodicals. It is those poorer classes to whom a new demand for pennies means more in their economic stresses than quarters or dollars mean to their more fortunate fellow citizens.



How, I ask you, Mr. Chairman, how can this attitude of the President and his authoritative spokesman, Secretary of the Interior Harold Ickes, be justified in the light of the iterated and reiterated promises of these men that they have at heart the interests of small industries and the common people?

President Roosevelt has taken the position that the press of this country should be denied the mail rates now accorded it and which have been the settled rates for scores of years. In that position he follows the philosophy of Mr. Ickes, who denounces the press as a "subsidized press" and who denounces the newspaper commentators as "kept commentators." In denouncing the press as he has, and in applying that offensive term of "kept commentators" to the writers of economic, social, and political comment and opinion, the Secretary of the Interior in his ungracious manner and his violent and unwarranted invective, has made the public assertion that these independent writers and commentators are harlots of their profession, ready for a price to prostitute their talents and their places in the literary world to the service of "aristocratic anarchists" and "economic royalists." That, Mr. Chairman, is a grave indictment. Little wonder it is that when he was called upon to name names and to cite instances the Secretary of the Interior took refuge behind weak and evasive statements that he had no special persons in mind and that he had not meant to accuse any specific newspaper or individual writer. It is time, Mr. Chairman, that these loose, violent, ill-conceived, and irresponsible accusations and epithets cease to flow from the lips of governmental officials who are supposed by reason of their high places and their duties to the whole people to be above such venomous and wanton invective when their plans are criticized or their acts are held up to public scrutiny through the columns of the public press.

What function, I ask you, has the press of America if it is not to keep the people informed of the acts of their public servants? What function has the press of America if it is not to comment freely on the policies and the methods of the reigning administration?

What function has the press of America, I ask you, Mr. Chairman, if it is not to keep the people informed, to interpret, clarify, and dissect the policies and acts of the public officials for the benefit of the citizens who have no other unrestricted avenue of information and analysis?

That Mr. Ickes should indulge in such tirades, and that he should take such an illogical position is not surprising. He has distinguished himself since he has been in public office by his ill temper, his ill-advised declarations, and his violent invective against any and all who oppose him or who incur his wrath. And, in passing, it might be observed that if Mr. Ickes, with his staff of sleuths and gumshoe men, had been half as assiduous in rooting out crookedness and misappropriation of Government funds and abuses of official positions and powers in his own Department under his own nose as he has been in seeking evidence upon which to attack a free press and independent commentators, the Government would have been saved a very large sum of money and the people would have been spared a lot of official venom which has been spewed over the air waves by the gentleman who is in charge of the Interior Department.

But, Mr. Chairman, how are we to account for President Roosevelt's joining his Secretary of the Interior in this assault on the American press?

The President must be aware, Mr. Chairman, of the fact that if the newspapers and periodicals of this country are forced to pay higher mail rates, that cost is not going to fall heaviest on the larger newspapers and magazines. It is going to fall with the most deadly effect on the small newspapers, the secular press, and the class publications.

The President certainly must be aware, as are we, that this increased cost will not and cannot be absorbed by the small newspapers and magazines, but must and will be passed on to the subscribers.

Mr. Roosevelt must be aware, as are we, that it is not the wealthy and the upper middle classes who will feel this new blow to their pocketbooks, but it will be felt most and

quickest by the poor, the submerged, the one-third who are ill-clad, ill-fed, and ill-housed, about whom Mr. Roosevelt has so eloquently spoken time and again.

If Mr. Roosevelt's assault on the press of America is successful, what class of publications are going to feel the most deadening effects of this blow, Mr. Chairman?

In order to get at this question of what and whom the President and Secretary Ickes are striking at, let us examine briefly some of the facts and figures about journalism in this country.

It so happens that I have had some experience in the newspaper business in connection with the rural press of America, and I know something of what this assault by the President means to the small newspapers of the United States.

This burden, if the mail rates are raised on the newspapers and magazines, will fall with most deadly effect on the weekly newspapers of the country. Next it will affect most adversely the religious and social press of America. Next it will hit the small daily newspapers the greatest blow, and, finally, it will touch but lightly the great daily press and the larger magazines and trade publications.

Consider the figures, Mr. Chairman:

*Newspapers and periodicals in the United States*  
(Ayers Newspaper Directory for 1937)

<b>Newspapers:</b>	
Daily.....	2,272
Daily (foreign).....	167
Triweekly.....	45
Semiweekly.....	401
Weekly.....	11,592
Fortnightly.....	3
Semi-monthly.....	15
Monthly.....	7
Miscellaneous.....	1
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>13,743</b>
<b>Periodicals:</b>	
Daily.....	131
Daily (foreign).....	11
Sunday edition.....	17
Triweekly.....	15
Semiweekly.....	65
Weekly.....	1,251
Fortnightly.....	173
Semi-monthly.....	253
Monthly.....	3,512
Bimonthly.....	203
Quarterly.....	530
Miscellaneous.....	187
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>6,320</b>
<b>Michigan:</b>	
Newspapers (daily and weekly).....	451
Periodicals.....	122

As will be seen by these newspaper statistics taken from a standard newspaper directory for 1937, the great majority of newspapers which would be affected by a change in postal rates are weekly newspapers. The great majority of the periodicals which would be affected are the monthly publications.

It will be seen from this table which I desire to insert at this point in my remarks that a total of 13,743 newspapers and a total of 6,320 periodicals would be affected by a change in the postal rates. In my own State of Michigan 451 newspapers and 122 periodicals would be thus affected.

Now, what do these figures mean?

They mean that the small weekly newspapers and the largely nonprofit secular press will be forced to raise their subscription rates. It means that the farmers, the people in the small towns and the urban districts, will be the ones who will have to bear the burden of this assault upon the press of America by the President and his Interior Secretary.

It means that the cost of reading, the cost of information, the cost of comment on public questions will be greatly increased to the poorer classes, to the farmers, who are now able to enjoy their publications at a fair and economical cost. Those are the ones who will be penalized by Mr. Roosevelt's assault on the American press. Those are the citizens at whose pocketbooks he is striking. Those are the citizens whose sources of information and comment he is attacking.

Postal officials have themselves been quoted on the floor of this Chamber within the last few days by the able gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] as authorities for the statement that the bulk of the newspapers carried by mail were some 15,000 rural publications delivered free within the counties.

Showing that it costs only \$660,000 a year to give the farmer his newspapers under this preferential treatment, the gentleman from Michigan proved to us by carefully prepared and authentic computations taken from the reports of the Post Office Department itself that in 4 years the loss of revenue through franking the inconceivable masses of the New Deal bureaucratic propaganda which flooded the country has been \$120,694,678. He showed further that if the costs of the paper and the printing of this governmental bureaucratic propaganda are added that the bill paid by the American taxpayer in the last 4 years has been \$220,803,425, or many, many times the alleged subsidy cost of providing the farmers of America with their newspapers and periodicals, and not the least of the bureau propaganda has emanated from the Interior Department. Mr. Roosevelt must be aware of these facts. He has access to these figures. He has at his command the experts to analyze them and to determine these facts.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let us examine another phase of this assault by President Roosevelt and his authorized spokesman on the press of America.

Mr. Roosevelt, in his statements to the Nation concerning what he termed a "subsidy" enjoyed by the press, stated that the annual amount of the subsidy was \$89,148,000. His clear intent was to lead the people to believe that the taxpayers were having to bear an annual charge of that amount which went into the pockets of the publishers, and that if the subsidy were denied the publications that the sum of \$89,148,000, or a very substantial portion of it, would be saved to the taxpayers.

Mr. Roosevelt's statement was wholly erroneous and unfair, and the only conclusion is that he has been grossly deceived by his advisers, something which is in itself inexcusable under any concept of safe and sound government.

The American Newspaper Publishers' Association, on January 8, called attention to these pertinent facts; I quote:

The question as to whether daily newspapers receive a subsidy from the Government in the nature of less-than-cost postal rates was settled in favor of the newspapers in 1925 by a joint committee of Congress, which investigated rates for all classes of mail users.

At that time the official representatives of the Post Office Department, appearing before the committee, testified that if every newspaper was removed from the mails there would be no appreciable saving to the Government because the postal establishment would have to be maintained for the public's benefit whether it handled newspapers or not. The hearings in 1925 demonstrated that charges of private agencies were far less than those of the Post Office Department for the same service. \* \* \*

Today more than 90 percent of the newspapers handled by the mails are for rural route delivery. The removal of these papers would not decrease the number of rural routes, but would decrease postal revenues and take from the residents of many rural routes vital sources of information.

These facts apply not only to the daily newspapers; they apply with greater force to the weekly newspapers, the religious, cultural, educational, and class magazines and periodicals.

Mr. Roosevelt certainly knew these facts when he made his unfair statements. At least he has at his command the assistants who could have ascertained the facts, and the only conclusion to be reached is, as I have said, that he has been grossly misled and deceived by his advisers in this matter.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let us see if we can find the reason behind this assault against the press of America.

There has not been a President nor an administration in the history of this Nation that has received more favorable treatment, more consideration, and more support than President Roosevelt and his administration. There has not been the slightest suppression by the press of any facts—nor of any statements, many of which were not facts—released by the present administration.

It is true that many of the administration policies and acts have been criticized by the press—and when and if the day ever comes that the press does not or dares not criticize administration policies and acts, that day free government will have disappeared from the face of the North American Continent and we will be living under the same kind of totalitarian government that today curses the peoples of Germany, Italy, Russia, and other dictator-ridden countries.

The greatest safeguard of our constitutional Republic, the greatest safeguard of the liberties of our people—religious, political, economic, and social—rests in a free and fearless press.

So, then, Mr. Chairman, what motive, what purpose lies behind this assault on the free press of America?

There has slowly evolved and taken shape before our eyes a definite plan which was conceived by the New Deal advisers when, if not before, Mr. Roosevelt took office.

Early in his administration an attempt was made to execute that plan in such measures as the A. A. A., the N. R. A., and similar laws, all looking to rigid centralization of government in the Federal executive department, with rigid regulation and regimentation of all lines of industry, agriculture, and labor by an all-powerful political bureaucracy.

It has now become clear that an important—a vital—part of that system was to accomplish the annihilation of any group, class, or agency which might oppose it by inciting a misinformed and excited public opinion to such hatred of it that any such group, class, or agency would be rendered impotent and would be silenced by the force of this misdirected public opinion.

It is now clear that there has never been any deviation from that plan up to this hour. There has never been the slightest tolerance for adverse comment, constructive criticism, or honest differences of opinion. From President Roosevelt down to the most minor bureaucrat the attitude under the New Deal has been that any individual, any group, or any agency that opposed the New Deal policies or criticized the New Deal policies or disagreed with the New Deal policies did so from the basest motives of greed, selfishness, treachery to the Nation, and hatred of all human decencies. No matter who supported or who agreed with the President and his New Deal policies, nor how long they agreed with and supported those policies, just let them but one time disagree and criticize one policy and they were forthwith damned by the New Dealers and vituperated publicly as traitors, as enemies of the people, who had sold out their principles and their influence to the "money changers" and the "economic royalists" for a price.

First, Mr. Roosevelt incited the hatred of the people against the "money changers." Then when many businessmen opposed some of the New Deal policies of regimentation they were labeled "economic royalists" and the public wrath was raised against them. Then when a new campaign of hatred was needed by the New Dealers they discovered the "princes of privilege." The public wrath was turned against them.

When a fearless and independent Federal judiciary stood in the way of unconstitutional acts whipped through a supine Congress, the guns of venom and hatred were turned on "the nine old men." The justices were held up to public abuse and scorn as senile, doddering, old reactionaries who had set themselves up as a sort of supergovernment.

Then when the legal fraternity came to the defense of the courts the vials of wrath and abuse were opened against the lawyers as "legalists."

When the most ardent supporters of Mr. Roosevelt and the New Deal, the most liberal of the Members of this Congress, fearing for the independence of the judiciary and the very foundations of the Constitution, found themselves conscience bound to oppose the President's court-packing plan, they were pilloried by the President and his New Deal spokesmen as traitors to their country, their party, and their principles. Not one single word came from the administration camp



even conceding that these men were honest and sincere in their convictions.

When the Court bill was beaten, the New Dealers turned their batteries of hate against the "Tories" and the "Macaulayites."

And, finally, when the boasts of the President and his spokesmen that prosperity had returned, and that recovery was accomplished because "we planned it that way" were refuted by the present depression, a new campaign of hatred had to be inaugurated in an attempt to shift responsibility from the shoulders of the administration onto the back of some group or class. It was then from the lips of the President and of his Assistant Attorney General, Robert H. Jackson, that we began to hear accusations against the "monopolists," and the new class of public enemies styled "aristocratic anarchists." At the same time, all of the venom of which Interior Secretary Harold Ickes is so capable was turned against the "subsidized" press and the "kept" commentators. Immediately Mr. Roosevelt took up the refrain of hate against the press, and so today we witness the unfolding of a campaign of reprisal against the press precisely as we have witnessed campaigns of reprisal against all these other groups and agencies which have dared to disagree with Mr. Roosevelt.

When the demand that he name names and cite instances to support his abusive accusations against a "subsidized press" and "kept commentators" grew so voluminous that he had to take notice, Mr. Ickes retreated behind the weak and discreditable assertion that he had not meant any specific newspapers or any particular writers. By that act he left all newspapers and all commentators wide open to the public suspicion of belonging to the very category Mr. Ickes had vituperated.

President Roosevelt, in the same position, when public demand grew that he name names and cite specific acts as proof of his assertions that "monopolists" and "aristocratic anarchists" had deliberately planned and precipitated the present depression in order to discredit New Deal policies, took refuge behind a refusal to name names or to cite specific acts and said that he was referring to a "generic group, not particularly individuals." So now our latest public enemies, our latest traitors to the Nation, are the press, the commentators, and those specterlike and evil-intentioned "generics" who flit, in ghostly elusiveness, through the shadows of the economic structure of the Nation working ruin to the welfare of the people out of the sheer glee of a satanic sadism. Piffle!

The entire system of trying to destroy any individual, any group, class, or agency which opposes the New Deal march toward an authoritarian form of government is behind this attempt to wreak reprisal against the press.

Whether it is intended by Mr. Roosevelt to be so or not, the inescapable effects of this campaign to increase the cost to the subscribers of all publications and printed avenues of information is calculated to turn hundreds of thousands to the radio for their only information and comment on vital public questions as they abandon their newspaper and periodical subscriptions.

No method exists under the Constitution for controlling or limiting a free press. The framers of the Constitution wisely saw to that. The radio is rapidly growing in importance and influence as an agency of communication. The agency for controlling that medium of information and comment does exist. It is the Federal Communications Commission, which is under the domination of the President and his New Dealers. The tenor, the quantity, and the kind of information and comment that go out over the radio can be controlled and regulated. I think the inference is plain.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this is the record. It has been made by Mr. Roosevelt and his New Deal advisers themselves. It is a public record that cannot be denied. And I do not hesitate to say that the most dangerous assault we have yet witnessed against constitutional government, against the liberties of the people, against tolerance, free speech, and free press, not excepting the court-packing plan, is to be found in this assault against the free press of America.

It behooves every newspaper and every other publication in this country to mass their strength to meet this new and dangerous onslaught against the Constitution and against free government, free press, and free speech.

It behooves every liberty-loving American who desires to see the Stars and Stripes remain the symbol of religious, political, and social tolerance to be alert and to refuse to be lured into this campaign to suppress free press and free speech in America.

The historic fact which since the World War has been demonstrated in several European countries is that suppression of free press and free speech leads straight to dictatorship, just as dictatorship must of necessity suppress and abolish free press and free speech. That fact should cause every liberty-loving American citizen to reject in scorn and indignation this proposal that the press of America be punished and muzzled and finally destroyed because it has dared to fulfill its true function of fearlessly reporting, analyzing, and opposing governmental, economic, or social policies which would, if carried out, transform our free Republic into the government of a Stalin, a Hitler, or a Mussolini. [Applause.]

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BOILEAU].

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I also yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BOILEAU].

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, for a long time I have taken the position that this country would be better off if instead of having two separate Departments for the War and Navy we had only one Department of National Defense. To this end I have introduced in the last two or three Congresses a bill which in the present Congress is known as H. R. 1488. This bill has for one of its purposes the consolidation of the Army and Navy into one Department of National Defense under a Secretary of National Defense, with three Undersecretaries, one for the Navy, one for the land force, and one for the air force. One of the things that will be accomplished by such a bill would be to have an appropriation bill come to this House at one time embodying all the phases of national defense.

In my judgment it is unfortunate that we have an appropriation bill for the Navy and an appropriation bill for the Army brought up separately. If we were to have appropriations for both arms of the national defense before the House in one appropriation bill we would get a little better picture of what our military establishments really are. I believe we would then be able to accomplish something along the line of eliminating from the so-called national defense those activities and agencies within the Army and Navy that are designed and primarily useful only for foreign aggressive warfare.

Mr. Chairman, the bill I refer to, H. R. 1488, provides further that this new Department of National Defense shall be reorganized so that there will be eliminated such activities and agencies that are designed and primarily useful only for foreign and aggressive wars. We should organize our defense policy and our defense establishment for defense only.

If this principle of defense only is accepted, so far as I am concerned I am willing to go down the line with any group of American citizens who are willing and anxious that we have an adequate national defense. Unfortunately at the present time the term "adequate national defense" means something in addition to defense. It means preparation for aggressive or foreign warfare. I am willing to eliminate all appropriations except those which are designed to take care of defense only.

Mr. PIERCE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOILEAU. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. PIERCE. Does defense include Alaska, the Hawaiian Islands, and the islands in the Caribbean Sea?

Mr. BOILEAU. Absolutely. I refer to the defense of the continental United States and its possessions and Territories. I am of the opinion we should prepare against invasion of those Territories and possessions, but I submit to the gentleman from Oregon if we want to defend those islands and

possessions and the continental United States, we should accept the statement made by Admiral Bristol in 1932 when he was Chief of Operations of the United States Navy. He stated at that time that the Navy is not intended primarily for the purpose of defending our coasts and our harbors. He said for this purpose we have land fortifications, submarines, mines, and the air corps. I submit to the gentleman from Oregon we should use those agencies for the defense of the continental United States. We should use those agencies for the defense of our possessions and our Territories.

May I say further to the gentleman from Oregon that in my judgment much of the activity of the Navy Department at the present time is designed to prepare us for a foreign war of aggression rather than a war of defense.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOILEAU. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Is it not a fact that the money to be spent upon our naval program for defense should be in the nature of the construction of aircraft carriers instead of the construction of heavy battleships?

Mr. BOILEAU. I agree with the gentleman absolutely. When we come to the point in the bill which carries the appropriation for these two battleships, I propose to offer an amendment to strike out that appropriation because I believe a battleship is an instrument of aggressive warfare and not for defensive warfare. If the House accepts my amendment then at the proper time I shall offer another amendment to take that amount which is included in this bill for the two battleships and use it for the purpose of constructing and equipping additional airplanes for the defense of this country.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOILEAU. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman agree with me a lot of the waste and inefficiency, and a lot of the trouble in the Army and Navy, would be eliminated if we could put the Army and Navy under one head and combine them for the purposes of efficiency?

Mr. BOILEAU. I think that would be a tremendous benefit to the country, and, as I stated a moment ago, I have introduced a bill along that line.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I have no desire to continue this line of questioning, because I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. BOILEAU. I appreciate the gentleman's statement.

Mr. RANDOLPH. But I hope he will present this matter of continued aircraft improvement in place of battleships in a manner that this committee and the House will join with him in seeing that this is done, for I believe we should support him in his efforts.

Mr. BOILEAU. I appreciate the gentleman's kind offer of assistance, and I know his assistance will go a long way toward bringing about this desired result.

To my mind, it does not make any sense to spend \$70,000,000 for a battleship when this same amount of money will build a thousand first-class bombing airplanes. In all seriousness, does a single Member of the House believe that from the standpoint of defending this country we would not be better off if we eliminate these two battleships and in their stead provide for the construction of approximately 2,000 bombing planes? This makes sense. I appreciate the fact a bombing plane does not have the life of 26 years which is the life of a battleship.

Mr. RANDOLPH. It does not take so long to build them, either.

Mr. BOILEAU. I thank the gentleman. However, if you take this \$140,000,000 which you originally put into the construction of two battleships and add to it the cost of maintaining the battleships during their lives of approximately 26 years, you will have a much larger amount than \$140,000,000. Take the amount you would thus arrive at and figure out the number of bombing planes you could build over a period of years. If we could eliminate these two battleships and thereby save the cost of construction and of maintaining and operating them for 26 years, I am satisfied the total amount

of money saved would be enough to provide for and operate a permanent squadron of hundreds, yes, perhaps a thousand, airplanes over a period of 26 years, and then some, and all during that time you would have an effective defense.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOILEAU. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Practically 5 years would be consumed in the construction of one battleship. If we are thinking about defense now, and the proper preparation by this country against invasion, we should think in terms of next year and the following year, not 5 years hence, when this \$70,000,000 battleship will be completed.

Mr. BOILEAU. The gentleman is correct. As the gentleman suggests, let us think about defense and defense only. Do not let some of these patriotic organizations fool you by their talk of what constitutes an adequate national defense. When the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars are about to hold their national encampments—and I have been advised of this by what I consider reliable authority, although I have not seen the letters myself—their national-defense committees write down here to the Navy Department and to the War Department for their recommendations as to what they want for the Navy and the Army. Then when the national encampment is in session these national-defense committees of both organizations, and I belong to both of them, report the identical programs submitted by the Navy and the Army as their recommendations for national defense. Then the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars national encampments swallow the recommendations of these committees, and you and I are told that such recommendations are the result of the deliberate judgment of the rank and file of the ex-service men of the country. This is ridiculous. It is unfortunate these two great patriotic ex-service men's organizations should be so misled.

I believe in defense as much as any other man in this body. I would not enlist in the United States Army for the purpose of fighting a foreign or aggressive war, but I would go as far as any other man in this body or in this country to support my country in the event of invasion or attack.

I do not believe these battleships are necessary. A thing that worries me a great deal is the fact that we have before us here today a naval appropriations bill which does not express the viewpoint of anybody. The distinguished gentleman from North Carolina, the chairman of the subcommittee, a man of outstanding ability, than whom no finer or more intelligent man now serves or has ever served in this body, in discussing this bill, made a statement to the effect that it carries out the policy of the administration and the policy of Congress. In saying it carries out the expressed policy of Congress, does the gentleman mean this bill carries all the appropriations authorized by existing law? No; he does not mean that, because he said we could go even further than this bill provides, under existing authorizations, in the construction of battleships. There is some question whether or not this bill does not go further than the law allows at the present time with reference to submarines and cruisers, so it is not the policy of Congress. At least, if the gentleman accepts the dictates of Congress in that respect, he should go all the way and adhere strictly to the mandates of Congress and provide for the full authorization.

Is it the administration's policy? He said it was, but can you call this the administration's policy when you and I and every one of us here today know that in a day or two the President of the United States, after we get this bill out of the way, will come in with a special message—some other suggestion—with reference to the Navy? Therefore, this is not the administration's policy, because everybody knows the President is going to come in here in a couple of days with a new policy.

Therefore, we must conclude, even though the gentleman from North Carolina does not say this represents the deliberate judgment of the Committee on Appropriations, that this is, after all, the handiwork and represents the better judgment of the Committee on Appropriations.



Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOILEAU. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. The gentleman will admit the Committee on Appropriations, in bringing this bill to the floor of the House, has carried out the President's message of last November?

Mr. BOILEAU. Oh, we are going to have another message in January, in just a couple of days. The gentleman knows it, and I know it. The protest I am making here is addressed to the President of the United States as well as the Committee on Appropriations, and it is that we should not be passing appropriations for a Navy program for 1939 until we have the whole picture before us. It is an insult to the Congress for the President of the United States deliberately to withhold his recommendations until after we have acted on this bill.

It seems to me the Committee on Appropriations is not dealing fairly with the House in bringing an appropriation bill in here, knowing all the time that in a few days we are going to have some other kind of naval program proposed. The Members who are going to vote for or against this program should know what is going to be finally proposed.

I started out my remarks by criticizing the fact we do not have the whole national-defense program before us at one time. We have the program broken up as between the Navy Department and the War Department, and now we are even breaking up the naval appropriations.

We bring in one naval appropriation bill, and although none of us know what the President is going to recommend it is generally understood he is going to have some message before this Congress in a few days that will affect naval appropriations or at least authorize further naval construction. He might ask for more battleships; I do not know. Maybe he will only ask for rowboats, but I am inclined to think that instead of asking for rowboats he will probably ask for some pretty heavy construction. He may also ask for more airplanes. He may have the same viewpoint that many of us have here with reference to aircraft, but do you not think he ought to tell us what he has in mind before we pass this appropriation bill?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOILEAU. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I am certainly in agreement with the gentleman from the standpoint of bringing before the Congress of the United States a national-defense program not broken up into Navy Department and War Department appropriation bills. Should we not, and quickly, try to create sentiment in this Congress to bring about a Department of National Defense instead of having a Secretary of War and a Secretary of the Navy in the Cabinet of the United States?

Mr. BOILEAU. I thank the gentleman. I do not know whether the gentleman was here when I stated that I have introduced a bill that proposes that very thing, and I believe it is a bill that merits the consideration of the membership of this House. I do not say that because I drew up the bill. The basis of the bill was one drawn up by the legislative counsel for Mr. Byrns, a former Speaker of the House, when he was either majority leader or chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOILEAU. I yield.

Mr. WOODRUM. The gentleman has referred to the fact that the Committee on Appropriations is breaking up the defense program into the Navy and War Departments. Of course, the gentleman should not lose sight of the fact that the Committee on Appropriations has brought to the Congress appropriations based upon existing authorizations as submitted by the Budget, and that is the matter that is before the Congress now and the one that Congress will pass upon. It seems to me the very reverse of what the gentleman from Wisconsin has stated is true, and the more

logical way to proceed would be to pass upon present authorizations and then the Congress can determine in a legitimate and orderly way whether or not it wishes to enlarge these organizations because, as the gentleman knows, of course, the Committee on Appropriations cannot say that we want 10 more battleships or so many more airplanes.

Mr. BOILEAU. They can provide for two more battleships.

Mr. WOODRUM. They are doing that in this bill.

Mr. BOILEAU. Two in addition to those provided for in the bill.

Mr. WOODRUM. We should pass upon these appropriations, and then it will be for the Congress to say whether or not it wishes to enlarge the program. It seems to me that this is logical consideration of the matter which the gentleman is asking.

Mr. BOILEAU. No; I would say to the gentleman that if we are going to have logical consideration of naval requirements, it all ought to be done at one time. What the President may recommend may not need additional authorization. I do not know. He could ask for two more battleships than those appropriated for in this bill. There would not be any additional legislation necessary in that respect except the appropriation bill, but I submit that the Appropriations Committee, knowing that the President has something very important to say to us in a day or two and is just waiting for us to get this matter out of the way, should delay consideration of this appropriation bill until his message is received and we know what he has to say. If we could see the whole picture there might be a few more Members of the House that would go along with those of us who are now saying, "My God, we are going in the wrong direction—we are heading for war!" and there might be enough sentiment of this sort in the House to kill the appropriation for the two useless battleships provided for in this bill.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOILEAU. I yield.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Then the sum and substance of the gentleman's argument is that the legislative committee and the Appropriations Committee should bring in the bill and the bill should be made up by the legislative committee?

Mr. BOILEAU. I think the President of the United States ought to have confidence enough in the Democratic Members of the House to put his cards on the table and that he ought to trust you. I am not a member of your party, but I am willing to trust you; at least, I am willing to trust you so long as I have the right to express my views and have the right to protest against what I might consider ill-advised legislation, but the President, certainly, ought to have confidence enough in the group here composed of you gentlemen on the Naval Appropriations Committee and on the Naval Affairs Committee to trust you. You are not the enemies of a big navy. You have not so demonstrated because you have been pretty willing to grab any kind of recommendation the Navy Department sends you. He does not have to feed it to you in two swallows because you have demonstrated a capacity to swallow it all in one gulp.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Wisconsin 3 additional minutes.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOILEAU. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I think we are all interested in anything the President of the United States has to say upon any important matter.

Mr. BOILEAU. Absolutely.

Mr. LUCAS. I am wondering whether or not the gentleman can tell the House the source of his information as to what the President may or may not say.

Mr. BOILEAU. Oh, I think I make it clear. I have no knowledge, and I presume no one of us has any knowledge

as to what he is going to say, but the gentleman knows, certainly, that the newspapers have been predicting for several days that the President is going to have a message here that is going to relate to the Navy. Does the gentleman agree to that statement that is generally recognized to be a fact?

Mr. LUCAS. Does not the gentleman think before he makes that sort of a veiled attack upon what the President may or may not say he should have reliable information before he does that?

Mr. BOILEAU. I am not making an attack upon the President or upon anybody. I am criticizing both the President and the Committee on Appropriations for bringing in a bill here affecting the Navy, when these members of the Committee on Appropriations and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] and myself and every one of us have every reason to believe that within a day or two there is going to be a special message here with reference to the Navy. What is going to be in that message I do not know. I do not claim to know, and I have no knowledge what the President will state in his message. It is predicted that he will send us such a message and, of course, he would have denied the newspaper reports if they were not true.

Mr. LUCAS. I think the gentleman from Wisconsin and the gentleman from Illinois agree that we do not believe everything we see in the newspapers and until the President authorizes or informs someone in authority as to what he is going to say—then I submit that no one should make such an earnest speech upon speculation or conjecture.

Mr. BOILEAU. The gentleman will see that such a message will be sent here within a few days.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOILEAU. Yes.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Does not the gentleman know that the Committee on Appropriations cannot deal with anything that may be sent here with reference to any addition to the fleet until it becomes a law?

Mr. BOILEAU. Does the gentleman know what is going to be in the message?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. No; but I am dealing with what is already in the law.

Mr. BOILEAU. And I will answer the question by saying that I know, and the gentleman who is chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee knows, that under existing law and authorization the President could tomorrow come in and say he advocates the addition of two battleships to those already provided in this bill, and the gentleman's committee would not have to consider it at all.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Because Congress has already authorized them and provided for them.

Mr. BOILEAU. That is it exactly.

Mr. VOORHIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOILEAU. Yes.

Mr. VOORHIS. I would like to go back to the gentleman's bill, H. R. 1488, and the principle involved in it. It appears to me that such an organization of our national-defense forces is reasonable, that it would be efficient and might tend to make those forces better knit, and as the gentleman himself has suggested, point them in the direction more definitely of defense. The question I want to ask is this: What argument, as far as the gentleman knows, can be used against a reasonable proposal of that kind?

Mr. BOILEAU. I have not heard any gentleman argue against it yet. I say to the gentleman that he can take the program provided for in that bill and talk it over with any man or woman in the United States, and he will find that practically all agree with its provisions, except that you must not go to an Army or a Navy man and talk with him. He would not dare talk. The intelligence and the brains of the Navy and the War Departments are not available to the people. Army and Navy officers are tongue-tied, because they must first receive authority from somebody above them in rank before they can state their mind. The gentleman and I cannot get information from them unless we can get

them over in the corner, and then they will say, "Oh, don't use my name." It is a disgrace to democracy. If they say anything which suggests reform in the service, they say, "Yes, I think this situation is bad, but don't use my name."

This censorship is curtailing the rights of American citizens. Intelligent officers cannot help to expose bad conditions in the service. They cannot tell you anything. The only officers you can get to talk about these conditions are those who have already retired, and after retirement some of them will tell you some of the things that have been and are going on in the War and Navy Departments.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has again expired.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON].

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, the constant increase in appropriations for national defense should be a matter of deepest concern to this House and to the people. Back in 1923, the first year that the Budget plan for making appropriations was in effect, we appropriated \$298,000,000 for the Navy, and that was further increased in 1930 to \$362,000,000, while the present bill carries over \$550,000,000. I think that we should be told against whom we are arming. So far as I am personally concerned, I am absolutely and completely in the dark as to the need for these tremendous appropriations, which we are told will later on be followed by a request for an additional substantial sum.

I am for an adequate Navy, and I feel every Member of this House is for an adequate Navy. I recall a very bitter fight back in 1922, when it looked as though the small-Navy crowd were going to put their program through, a proposal which, as I recall, would have drastically reduced the personnel of all branches of the service. The battle lasted 3 or 4 days. At that time I stood with the so-called big-Navy crowd. I believe in a sufficient Navy, because the Navy is our first line of defense; but I am wondering, in the light of past experience, whether Congress is justified in appropriating \$140,000,000 for two battleships at this time. You know \$140,000,000 will build a lot of airplanes. I think Italy, with her superior air force, demonstrated conclusively when she backed Great Britain and France up against the wall 2 years ago, because of her superior air force, that the naval powers are afraid of aircraft. It follows, in view of what happened over in the Mediterranean at that time, that all nations fear those countries that are well equipped in the air.

Let us turn to the Battle of Jutland. I do not pose as a naval expert, like my good friend from Georgia—

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I do not pose as one.

Mr. KNUTSON. Or my friend from California, but if my memory serves me correctly, the Battle of Jutland demonstrated that the German pocket cruisers were more effective and caused more destruction in that battle than did the big superdreadnaughts of the British Navy.

I happened to have read an article several years ago to the effect that the advantage of the Battle of Jutland rested with the German fleet, more especially in view of the great disparity in tonnage strength between the two fleets.

It is generally conceded, I think, that we have supremacy in the air at the present time. I have noticed that each time an appropriation bill comes up for the Army or the Navy we are told of some mysterious power that is threatening our national security. This has been going on as long as I can remember and, I assume, long, long before that. Now, \$140,000,000, especially in view of the condition of the National Treasury at this time, is a very considerable item. This sum of money would, for instance, build 2,800 scouting or observation planes, according to the table published on page 490 of the committee hearings. This sum would build 5,600 miles of concrete highway at a cost of \$25,000 per mile; and it may be interesting to note that it would build 1,400 community hospitals where the underprivileged could receive free treatment.

I think—it may be that the committees have this information, but, if so, there is nothing to indicate it—that the Congress should be taken into the confidence of the executive



department and that we should be told if any danger threatens our country. There is not a man here who would vote against providing for ample national security. There are no pacifists in this House, but we do not want to vote needless sums for this or any other purpose.

I do not understand why the President does not call a disarmament conference of all the leading nations—Great Britain, France, Italy, Germany, Russia—and such others as he may decide to call. We are in this mad race 100 percent. We talk about Germany, Italy, France, and Great Britain spending such vast sums. Great Britain is going to spend \$7,500,000,000 in the next 5 years for preparedness. Why would it not be much better for the President to call these countries together to see if we could not arrive at some agreement about minimum expenditures for war? I feel that the time is ripe for such a conference. There has been no effort made to do that; but each time the legislative branch of these various governments meet they vote additional huge sums for defense purposes, and the spending of this money is really not going to bring anyone save the munitions makers any return in the long run. [Applause.]

Last March I introduced a concurrent resolution asking the President to call an international disarmament conference with a view to stopping this mad armament race that is rapidly sapping the lifeblood of civilization. Why has he not done so? The people of the world are sick of war, and they want the crushing load of preparedness lifted from their shoulders. Here is a good place to make a beginning in that direction, and I shall do what I can to lighten the load by voting to eliminate the item for two new superbattleships, and, failing in that, I shall vote against the passage of the bill. It is all very well to talk about reduction in armaments; but here we have a case where action speaks louder than words, and I invite the House membership to join me in the the fight to keep America out of the next war.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, under permission to extend my remarks, I would like to call attention to the following matter, since it has particular interest to the employees and employers in many industries in my State of Vermont and the New England area.

Sometime ago I sent letters to many of the manufacturing establishments, chambers of commerce, industry associations, and the like in my State of Vermont calling their particular attention to the recent announcement by the State Department of impending trade agreement negotiations to be presently entered into between the United States and the United Kingdom, and the United Kingdom on the part of Newfoundland and the British Colonial Empire.

I did this after a careful reading of this State Department announcement in which there was set forth a long list of products "which will come under consideration for the possible granting of concessions by the Government of the United States"—or, in other words, "on which the present tariffs may be further reduced."

I found therein many, many products manufactured in Vermont and the nearby New England area. It was my thought that the manufacturing establishments involved, for their own sake and that of the people they employ, should have it forcibly brought to their attention so that adequate representations may be made to the Committee for Reciprocity Information prior to the announced closing date for applications on February 19, less than a month hence.

Included among those to whom I sent communications are the following:

James F. Dewey, president of Associated Industries of Vermont, and of the A. G. Dewey Co., woolen manufacturers of Quechee; Gay Bros., woolen manufacturers of Cavendish; James P. Taylor, secretary of the Vermont Chamber of Commerce, Burlington; R. C. Taft, manager, American Fork & Hoe Co., of Wallingford; Jewel Brook Woolen Co., of Ludlow; Johnson Woolen Mills, of Johnson; Harris, Emery Woolen Co., of Quechee; Bridgewater Woolen Co., of Bridgewater; Black Bear Woolen Co., of Proctorsville; American Woolen Co., of Winoski; Lion Brand Shirt & Collar Corporation, of Fair Haven; Fort Dummer Mills, of Brattleboro; Newton Thompson Manufacturing Co., of Brandon; Bullard Lumber Co., of North Hyde Park; Queen City Cotton Co., of Burlington; the Aiken Nurs-

eries, of Putney; the Pilgrim Plywood Co., of Waterbury; Roy Bros., of Barnet; and others.

On January 13 I addressed the following letter to the president of the Vermont Chamber of Commerce:

JANUARY 12, 1938.

PRESIDENT, VERMONT STATE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,  
Montpelier, Vt.

(Attention of James P. Taylor, secretary.)

FRIEND: I have been looking over the copy of the State Department's news release relating to the announcement of the trade-agreement negotiations with the Government of the United Kingdom and with that Government on behalf of Newfoundland and the British Colonial Empire.

Therein, listed among those products on which the United States "will consider granting concessions" are many products currently manufactured in Vermont, I find. Among the many products set forth I might mention the following:

Flavoring extracts; hay forks; scoops; shovels, spades, and drainage tools; textile machinery; forks, hoes, rakes, and agricultural hand tools; veneers of wood; furniture, wholly or partly finished; cuttings, seedlings, and grafted or budded plants or evergreen ornamental trees, shrubs, or vines, and all other nursery or greenhouse stock, not specially provided for; cotton manufactures; woolen woven fabrics; felts, belts, blankets, jackets, and other machine clothing; blankets and similar articles (including carriage and automobile robes and steamer rugs) made of blanketing, as units or in the piece; field hockey sticks and guards, polo mallets, table-tennis bats, croquet mallets, golf clubs and tees, soccer guards; and others.

I have written to several of those I believe might be interested in (and adversely affected by) a downward revision of the present tariff on their goods, but I have not covered the field, I am sure. It would appear to me to be wise for those whose products are so listed to submit briefs setting forth their views as to the reasons why their products should not be among those used by the Government in this "trading" and that the tariffs be allowed to stand as they are at present. Were the tariffs to be substantially lowered, there would be a consequent increase in unemployment due to the increased competition that would come from the imported goods, adversely affecting our local manufacturers and their products.

We have seen the detrimental effects of some of the trade agreements that have been negotiated heretofore, and it would appear to be prudent for those whose products might be affected to submit briefs.

I notice that the closing date for submission of briefs has been set at February 19, 1938, and this same date is the closing date for application to be heard. Public hearings open March 14, 1938. The written statements filed must either be typewritten or printed and must be submitted in six copies, of which one shall be sworn to. All information and views must be in writing, and all applications for supplemental oral presentation of views should be submitted to the chairman of the above-mentioned committee prior to the date indicated.

My thought in writing to you at this length is that this matter, of primary importance to many small business organizations in Vermont, might be, inadvertently, overlooked until too late for proper filing.

I am sure you know that if there is any way in which I can supply further information along this line, or any other, to you or to any of those who may be affected, that all you have to do is to call on me.

With best wishes for the new year, I am,

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES A. PLUMLEY,  
Member of Congress from Vermont.

On January 17 I made the following statement concerning the matter:

The proposed trade-agreement negotiations presently to be entered into by the United States and the United Kingdom should be given close attention and viewed with considerable concern by many, if not most, of the New England industries and those employed by them.

With the listing of those articles "which will come under consideration for the possible granting of concessions," we find a virtual manual of products manufactured in our small New England villages and towns. Should downward revision of the tariffs on the products mentioned be the result of these negotiations, the consequent chaos caused to the employment status of thousands of employees in the New England area alone will be startling.

If the tariffs on woolen products listed should be lowered substantially, to cite but one of many examples, I fear that this may be the coup de grace, and we will find hundreds of our small industries upon which the welfare of countless small New England communities have depended forced to close up shop. This industry has been in the doldrums for 2 or 3 months, due to a variety of causes, among which might be mentioned the taxes levied by the Government, including the malignant, pernicious undivided surplus tax saddled on them by a Government subject to vacillating direction, and the iniquities of a few offenders causing restrictive measures to be placed on all business, with a consequent destruction of all business confidence.

This industry now sees that it may have the present tariff on goods it manufactures substantially reduced, thus to let in a flood of foreign-made goods in direct competition with theirs—products manufactured by considerably lower-paid labor accustomed to a much lower standard of living, subject to much longer working hours throughout the British Colonial Empire. Yet, our woolen people, employers and employees, are not asking for nor advocating higher tariffs on woolens; they do strenuously insist, I am sure, that enough tariff be kept on their products to insure continuance of the present American standard of living and the continuance of their businesses.

The northern New England veneer and plywood and wood novelty people are as deeply concerned as are the woolen people; so, too, are the employers and employees of manufacturing establishments engaged in the production of the following products: Textile machinery; cotton manufactures; furniture; forks, hoes, rakes, scoops, shovels, spades, drainage tools, and agricultural hand tools; embroidery, knitting, braiding, and insulating machines; wrapping and packing machinery; cordage machinery; lithographically printed materials; drawing, hanging, filtering, and stencil papers; bound and unbound books of all kinds; various leather articles, shoes—particularly those made by the welt process; fishing materials; electric brushes; table and kitchen articles; optical glass; saddlery and harness hardware; and so on ad infinitum.

I have called this matter, which I envision as being of serious importance, to the particular attention of many Vermont industries involved and find that my concern is well-founded, as evidenced by replies had to my recent communications to them. I wish to emphasize that those who wish to file briefs should do so before the closing date of February 19.

[Applause.]

It should be borne in mind that the concessions, that is, lowering of the existing tariffs, are not decided upon until after the interested parties have been given the opportunity to present their views to the committee mentioned above. It is so that these views may be made, and prior to the closing date, that those engaged in the industries listed in the foregoing should find this matter of importance.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I am asking all interested parties to scrutinize carefully the State Department's release on the impending trade-agreement negotiations with the United Kingdom.

And I ask, Is your product there? Is it on the list? Let the Committee for Reciprocity Information know what effect the lowering of the tariff on your product will have on you as an employee; on you as an employer; on you as a member of your industry.

Do so before February 19 next.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman yields back 2 minutes.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, a few memories come trooping from the mists of the past as I add my contribution to the annual naval appropriation bill. You gentlemen will remember when the 1938 naval appropriation bill was before this body, I suggested an amendment under which no part of the appropriation made therein would be available for the pay of any officer or enlisted man who was on duty in China after January 1, 1938. That bill was considered in April or May of 1937. Some of the press characterized the proposal as absurd. Yet, in the light of the present, there are many who probably wish that that amendment had been adopted.

However, the boys are still there. In Peiping are 528 marines. In Tientsin are 814 members of the Army. In Shanghai are 2,555 marines. In addition, the Navy still has 129 officers, 1,671 enlisted men, and 13 vessels from the Asiatic Fleet in those troublous waters.

Much has happened since that amendment was offered. Much may happen before a single dollar of the present pending naval appropriation bill is expended. The future is spanned with uncertainties.

Mr. Chairman, we talk a good deal about our Navy. I think the term is slightly inaccurate because, as a matter of fact, we have three Navies. We have one Navy coming, one Navy going, and one Navy in existence. We have one Navy on keels. We have one Navy being decommissioned every year. We have one Navy that is being maintained every year. The \$550,000,000 provided in the pending appropriation bill is an appropriation for three navies. Make no mistake about

that. There are sundry millions for those ships that are to be built. There is a certain amount of money for decommissioning the vessels that are over age. Then there is the maintenance of all these incidents to the existing Navy. Those are all represented by the \$550,000,000 provided in the pending bill.

It is an astronomical sum. There is no fooling about that. You cannot fool the American people on this matter and as I think of it, of course, I kind of fish around trying to get my feet on solid ground by believing that somehow, somewhere, someplace I can identify in this bill and in all the enabling legislation and authorizations a naval policy that at least to me as a patriotic citizen would be satisfactory.

The first thing one ought to do is to go back and make a few comparisons. Let us go back 50 years to 1887. That is a rather memorable year. A great Democrat, Grover Cleveland, was President of the United States for his first term. It is a memorable year because it is the year in which the Interstate Commerce Commission was born, which Commission observed its golden jubilee anniversary last year. In that year the appropriations for the Navy were how much? Have you any idea? Approximately \$13,000,000. Thirteen million dollars 50 years ago. A mere drop in the bucket. Compare that with \$550,000,000 50 years later in 1937. The very comparison in itself ought to stimulate some thinking and wonder perhaps, first, as to whether we are on the right track and, second, whether the people who are spending our money for armament should have expert business advice on the subject.

When I say this is a continuing Navy and this is a continuing pattern, all you need to do is to examine the treaty under which these ships are laid down. Capital ships are over age when they are 26 years old. Ships in the lighter weight classes become over age at from 12 to 16 years. Aircraft carriers are over age when they reach 20 years, and submarines are over age when they reach 13.

So automatically when the vessels in our Navy reach these ages they are tagged with the over-age sign. Prior to that time we start to lay keels and begin the construction of the third Navy that is coming on, so to speak, so it will be ready when the over-age Navy is ready for decommission.

Mr. Chairman, as long as the armament race continues, and as long as this mad, competitive race for naval supremacy continues, you are going to have this never-ending pattern, you are going to have this continuing expense. The very unequivocal language of the treaty is the best assurance that is going to happen, not only in 1937 but in 1947, 1957, and 1967, and the years hence, and so long as the provisions of the treaty or like provisions exist and operate, so far as the United States of America is concerned.

Mr. SCOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SCOTT. Has the Congress of the United States ever said what an adequate Navy is?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me get to that directly.

That is your pattern. There are your three navies. There is the tremendous expense. There is the tremendous increase from \$13,000,000 in 1887 to \$550,000,000 in 1937.

There is something else. This was a hint that was dropped when the bill was pending before the full committee, and it became impressive to me. It came from my good friend from North Carolina, who is chairman of this subcommittee, a man, in my judgment, of resplendent ability and one of the outstanding Members of this body. I think he was on good ground when he mentioned the fact that we dip into every congressional district and pick young men between the ages of 17 and 21 who have had an academic education in high school, put them through an examination, send them to the Naval Academy. After 4 years of effort there, without a lick of business experience, without ever having made a single dollar for the most part, they are discharged into the Navy, and after a few years they attain higher rank. Some of them are then placed in positions of responsibility, in



which positions they spend hundreds of millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money.

Let us reflect on that a moment. Four years in the academy after the superintendent or the principal of a high school hands one that very valued "sheepskin," as it used to be referred to. Four years at the academy, then in as an ensign, junior lieutenant, senior lieutenant, and on through the grades. They are then placed in some position where they start spending the money of the taxpayers without any real business background. When you put this tremendous expenditure together with that background of experience on the part of the personnel that spends the money it makes you wonder whether or not there is some device whereby the taxpayers can be assured that they will get their money's worth and that we might have the same adequate Navy without this tremendous expenditure.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Permit me to go along.

Mr. Chairman, I have always been impressed with the remark that Premier Gladstone once made to a noted Englishman. This Englishman said to him, "Mr. Gladstone, why do you not let this country live like a gentleman?" "Oh," he said, "my dear sir, to let the country live like a gentleman would cost five times what it should cost."

That is a remark which is pregnant with significance; and, as I think of it, I wonder whether the philosophy involved there might not be articulated with respect to the expenditures for the Navy. I wonder if we could not reach out somewhere and get men of extraordinary talent and business ability, setting them up perhaps as a kind of advisory or supervisory council, in the hope that they may tell us just why it is going to cost \$70,000,000 to build a capital ship this year or next year when it only cost \$53,000,000 a few years ago. It may be the Walsh-Healey bill; it may be the appreciation in the cost of material and labor. It may be one of a conglomeration of factors—I do not know—but it does appeal to me as just an ordinary citizen that the jump from \$53,000,000 to \$70,000,000 for a single battleship is an outrageous appreciation in the cost; and we must be mindful of the fact it is the taxpayers of this country who are going to pay the bill.

It might be that a civilian advisory council, armed with adequate authority, would serve a most useful purpose in this respect.

This suggestion is in nowise intended as a reflection upon the integrity of a single officer or enlisted man in the Navy. The record is sufficiently persuasive that the integrity of the Navy is of the highest order. My suggestion concerns itself only with business judgment, sagacity, and the ability to procure a dollar's worth of value for every dollar of outlay on an arm of the Government that now and henceforth will be costing well over a half billion dollars each year.

Mr. BOILEAU. I believe the gentleman is in error in jumping from fifty-three million to seventy million in 3 years.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I did not say "3 years"; I said "over a few years."

Mr. BOILEAU. May I point out that last year we had here a bill, in the discussion of which it was said the cost of a battleship was only \$50,000,000. By the time the bill came back from the Senate the amount was \$60,000,000. We no more than get into this session than the amount becomes \$70,000,000. It is silly.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I believe this is a matter which ought to engage the best judgment and the interest of Congress, for if we could have the same adequate defense, as they say, and yet save \$100,000,000, certainly we could afford to spend a million dollars for the best personnel this country offers in the hope they would checkmate and put the brakes, if and when necessary, on those who wear the uniforms and too often see only in terms of tonnage and dollars and personnel and all the things which are incident to the uniformed service.

I now yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. I am sure the gentleman has made a fine point in that he believes in putting into the administration of the

Navy some business experience, and in that way probably save a lot of money; but on the question of the comparison of the amount spent for the Navy in 1887, 50 years ago, \$13,000,000, with the \$550,000,000 now sought to be appropriated, can the gentleman give us any information regarding the population we had at that time, which was 20 years before the Spanish-American War, and our lack of outlying possessions then?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let us look at it in this manner: You cannot carry out a strict theory of ratio, for instance, when you are looking at these problems, because if you did we would have to recede materially on this appropriation. This amount represents 40 times what we expended in 1887. Is there anybody who will stand in his place and say the population in 1937 is 40 times what it was in 1887? Will you say the wealth of the country is 40 times what it was in 1887? Will you say the hazard is 40 times what it was in 1887? I appreciate there must be increases as the country grows, but this is not the essential or fundamental point I make. The thing about which I am concerned is whether or not, when we spend \$550,000,000 out of the public till, we are getting \$550,000,000 worth of value. [Applause.] If we are not getting it, then we ought to do something about it.

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Briefly.

Mr. FADDIS. I very much agree with the statement of the gentleman in that respect, as well as with the statement of the chairman of the subcommittee yesterday. I have observed the same thing in connection with Army construction, in that we do not get our money's worth out of it. There should be some means of determining and assuring the taxpayers they are getting their money's worth out of the money spent for this purpose.

Mr. ANDRESEN of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield very briefly.

Mr. ANDRESEN of Minnesota. Do not we have a Secretary of War who is a civilian, and also an Assistant Secretary of War and several other men who are supposed to have some business knowledge?

Mr. DIRKSEN. When the gentleman used the word "supposed," of course, he placed his own construction on the matter.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. Does not the gentleman believe the increase in the cost of these battleships is perhaps due in large measure to the labor troubles we have been experiencing, as has been explained somewhat by the Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Swanson?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I may say to the gentleman I do not know.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BOILEAU. Certainly the labor troubles would not have anything to do with the estimates, because it is only the estimates that have changed. Labor troubles do not bother the estimates.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is correct.

Mr. SHORT. Certainly the estimate will be determined largely by the conditions which prevail at the time.

Mr. BOILEAU. What the gentleman means is whether or not prices are increased.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Now comes this very happy and ubiquitous phrase, "adequate national defense," one of the phrases which covers a multitude of sins. No doubt all of you when you were candidates for office received questionnaires from patriotic organizations, and on them there was this question, "What is your attitude on the matter of preparedness and defense?" In the little blank which is provided you say, "I believe in and will support a program for adequate national defense." Very satisfactory; it answers all questions, glosses over every refined question, and satisfies those who have propounded the questions.

This phrase has intrigued me a great deal—"adequate national defense." Before we get to the adjective let us look at "national defense." What does it mean? Do you know?

Do I know? I confess I am not sure I know. I rather fancy there may not be a Member of this House or another body, in the light of the way this phrase has been bandied about, who can quite tell you what adequate national defense is or means and what the implications of the term are.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Does it mean the kind of defense which is going to provide the complements of war and personnel and all those military accoutrements, men, munitions, and ordnance, which are going to defend this country and its Territories? Is this what it means? I may say in the light of the things which are happening in the Orient at the present time, the deployment of some of our warships and some of our marines, the members of our Military Establishment, and the members of our Naval Establishment over in China, if it means national defense, if it means the defense of this Nation here and now and its Territories, that might certainly give a new slant on the kind of vessels we want to build and the size of the Navy, because when you talk of national defense there are other factors which come into the picture. First of all, there is the factor of isolation between two broad oceans. Talk until the vaults of heaven ring, but you cannot minimize the fact we are sitting here between two broad oceans, which has great bearing on defense. It has a tremendous bearing and interest upon our Aerial Establishment. When I soldiered in the old country during the World War I was in four countries during the same day. I was in Belgium, Germany, Luxemburg, and France, as I recall, all in the same day. You can see the need for these winged messengers of death that can go over the boundary lines of those countries, and that is altogether a different strategic situation and condition from what obtains in this country, with the Atlantic Ocean on one side and the Pacific Ocean on the other.

Then you cannot forget the mathematical factor when they talk about invading this country. The *Leviathan* used to carry 9,500 people. If you are going to send an invading force of 500,000, and you need not think of anything less than that, how many ships will you need? You will need 50 or 60 ships of that character, and what will you need in the way of convoys and what kind of auxiliary and supply vessels will you need—hundreds of them. There is not a navy in the world, if it were multiplied by five, that could undertake a task of that kind, in invading this Nation.

So, when you look at the mathematical factor we are not so bad off in this matter of national defense; but if national defense means we are going to poke around in the corners of the world, then, of course, it is a different matter.

In this respect I have wondered often about the statements of the President. I think first of all of his remark to the press on the 6th of September when he said—

Our nationals must leave China, and if they stay there they remain at their peril.

We evacuated 4,000 of the 10,500, and I understand from a memorandum of the State Department we still have about 6,500 over there. Is it a part of national defense that we should go over there and be ready for any eventuality in China? Frankly, I do not know, and I do not believe you do either, with all deference to your judgment and your vision in the matter.

Secondly, does it mean we are going to maintain bases like the Philippines and are we going to defend them at all hazards?

Well, we have spent \$50,000,000 on Pearl Harbor, and if you will read the very meager report in the hearings here, we can only moor a very small proportion of our fleet in Pearl Harbor. I think the members of the committee would probably bear out that statement; at least, I get that from a reading of the report, and if I am not correct I will stand corrected by my compatriot on the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman, with pleasure.

Mr. DITTER. With regard to the gentleman's assertion, I feel confident he does not want to make a misstatement to the House.

Mr. DIRKSEN. No, indeed.

Mr. DITTER. And may I say to the gentleman that I believe the present facilities and those still under contemplation at Pearl Harbor will provide a safe harbor for the battleship fleet.

Mr. DIRKSEN. For the battleship fleet. We are doing work now on Pearl Harbor, and we are appropriating money in this bill for Pearl Harbor, and the contention I want to make is that we have got to go on spending money to maintain a distant base out there, and when it has been maintained it is always a question of whether you can supply an aerial armada if you should transport it out there for a flight in the Orient somewhere, or the capital ships or the other components of the Navy. So it becomes a continuing job, and the question that presents itself to me is, Is that a part of national defense?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Our great first President, George Washington, advised his country to be in a defensive posture at all times. Has the gentleman any notion as to what he meant by "defensive posture" as bearing on this matter? If I may be permitted to say it, when I link this advice of President Washington with his other sage advice to his countrymen to avoid foreign entanglements, I feel that Washington did not sanction our preparation to fight the whole world in distant parts of the globe.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I will say to my good friend that when I think of defense I cannot escape the definition I heard given by one of the military authorities of this country when he was speaking of the war and said, "War is a form of political action." You will have a hard time improving on that definition, and if we are going to set up establishments that are going to be ready for that, it means the articulation of political action in the far corners of the world, and if so—well, I just shudder to think what the ultimate burden upon the taxpayers of this country is going to be for that kind of an establishment.

Let me make this other point. Does national defense also include the purport of the President's speech at Chicago that was referred to by my friend from Pennsylvania, when the President said that lawless nations ought to be quarantined? Does national defense mean to go out and thrust against the nations in all the corners of the earth, and if it does, I submit to everybody here that we might just as well discard this term "national defense" first as last and quit hoodwinking the American people and the Members of the Congress. Let us find a phrase which adequately expresses the policy upon which we may be embarking.

In September the President warned our nationals out of China. In October he made the speech at Chicago in which he suggested the "quarantining of lawless nations." In December came the *Panay* incident with its dangerous implications. These utterances raise some extremely important questions.

Will the warning to our nationals be reiterated? That is for the President to say. So long as they are there, what are the prospects for critical complications that may provoke the war hysteria? That is a wholly unpredictable situation that is in the lap of the gods. But it is full of significance for our people.

Then comes the broader question of naval policy as we continue to discuss national defense, particularly in the light of the oft-repeated statement that we are soon to have a message from the President suggesting an enlargement of our Naval Establishment.

What with our isolation, our vast resources, and the fact that no foreign nation has a base upon this continent from



which it could replenish the needs of an air fleet, a navy, or an army, one cannot escape the implication that if there is to be a substantial increase in the number of combatant ships in our Navy, that we are pointing in the direction of a foreign policy and a naval policy that goes quite beyond the requirements of national defense. It brings to mind the answer once made by the celebrated German general, Von Moltke, when asked whether he could land an army in Great Britain. He said, "Certainly, but how shall we get them back." The implication was that it would require an enormous fleet of combatant vessels, supply ships, auxiliary vessels, and others to negotiate the landing and returning of an invading force. Are we building up to that requirement? I do not profess to know, but it is singular indeed if we substantially augment our Navy only for national defense in the accepted sense of the word.

The participation of our ships in the British maneuvers at Singapore or Australia would indicate that we are gradually choosing to join with Great Britain as an exponent of democracy in showing our teeth as a part of the quarantine movement, and undertaking the role of world policeman. Can such a role be properly included in the generic term "adequate national defense" and if not, is it not high time that we found a suitable term to express the naval policy of our country that will truly apprise our people of what the administration intends to do.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I had not planned to say anything on the pending bill today. However, having asked a number of questions of the able and distinguished chairman when the Navy bill was reported to the full Committee on Appropriations, as well as on the floor of the House since this bill was reported here, I desire to make some brief observations.

Let me again say, as I have stated in the committee and on this floor, that I am a firm believer in reasonable and adequate national defense. I have made that plain many times, but so there may be no misunderstanding, I desire to reiterate it once more today. I am not one of those who would wish to sink the Navy or to impair its usefulness. Moreover, it is my deliberate conviction that the United States should have a strong and efficient Navy in order to defend our borders against any and all foreign foes, actual or imaginary.

I do not pose as being an expert on naval matters or national defense, although I have given the matter considerable study, having served several years on the Military Affairs Committee of this House.

There are two items in the pending bill that I desire in the brief time that is mine to discuss. I hope that I may be permitted to continue without interruption until I have at least touched the two items that I have in mind and about which I have asked some questions.

Much has been said this afternoon on retirement pay to officers and enlisted men. The chairman gave some astounding figures as to the mounting costs of retiring naval officers and men. It was brought out by the chairman that many enlisted men are now actually permitted to retire at the age of 38, which in my judgment is inexcusable from any standpoint. It is my deliberate judgment that no governmental employee, whether in the United States Navy, United States Army, Marine Corps, or any other branch of Government, should be permitted to retire at the age of 38. Thousands of young men enlist in the United States Navy at the age of 18, with their parents' consent, and many others, as a matter of fact, have enlisted at 15 and 16 years of age, although they, of course, said they were 18. That means, under the present system, young men 35 to 38 years of age are actually retired with retirement pay to go out into the world with civilians and in many instances are given preference over civilians because of their service in the United States Navy.

This is not the first time I have mentioned this appalling situation before the committee and on the floor of this House. I submit in all candor that enlisted men of the Navy should be required to make a reasonable contribution to any retirement fund. Something must be done to meet this rapidly increasing, if not staggering, amount that soon will become necessary to retire all the officers and men who wish to retire after only 20 years of service.

We have the sorry spectacle of naval officers retiring at 45, 46, and 50 years of age after a minor injury to a foot or ankle on the theory they are no longer able for service for which this Government has spent a lot of money to train them. Frankly, I feel that any boy who desires to enter the Naval or Military Academy should be willing to make the Navy or Army his life's work. I have repeatedly told applicants to these great institutions that I would not recommend the appointment of any young man whose only desire was to get a "free ride" of 4 years' training at the expense of the Government. Therefore, I cannot bring myself to feel that it is good business judgment and sound national defense to permit the retirement of either an officer or an enlisted man at the "ripe old age" of 38 years.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Vinson], in a very able argument a few minutes ago, from his standpoint, admitted at first blush this retirement situation looks bad. I agree with him thoroughly that it does look bad on first blush, but I want to say to you further that on second blush the situation looks considerably worse.

For several years I have opposed this so-called selective method of retirement after only 20 years of actual service, and I give notice now that I shall continue my opposition until something constructive is done about it.

The other item in this bill that I cannot bring myself—with the information I have at hand—to agree with this committee is with reference to the two proposed \$70,000,000 floating palaces. Of course, I agree that this item is much desired by the average naval officer, but I feel it is an extravagant expenditure of the taxpayers' money and certainly not in keeping with my idea of national defense. I am unwilling, Mr. Chairman, in this, as well as in other items in this bill, to accept without question the so-called naval authorities. The chairman of this subcommittee made it very plain in his opening statement yesterday that the average naval officer has not had the opportunity to have any actual business experience. Yet it seems that this committee is depending very heavily, so far as policy is concerned, on naval officers and retired officers. If I recall correctly, the chairman of the subcommittee admitted very frankly that he did not know whether these two mammoth \$70,000,000 battleships are more urgently needed than some other ships, like destroyers, fast cruisers, and bombers, but that his committee relied on what he called "our naval authorities."

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. UMSTEAD. What is the gentleman's question? Does the gentleman say he did not get an answer?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I merely suggested the distinguished gentleman and his committee may have depended too heavily on the judgment of naval authorities.

Mr. UMSTEAD. On what?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. On the construction of the two floating palaces, of \$70,000,000 each, carried in this bill.

Mr. UMSTEAD. I would like to answer the gentleman's question. That is the first time that he has asked it on the floor. I answered it in the committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is correct. The gentleman admitted that he took the word of the so-called naval authorities.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Well—

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Just a moment. I have no word of criticism. I have endeavored to make that plain. But for my part I feel this committee should be a policy-making committee and that this Congress should make the policy as to whether or not we want these \$70,000,000 battle-

ships, or whether we are to blindly take the advice of the so-called authorities, some of whom are retired naval officers.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Oklahoma yield to the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I will yield to him if he will give me more time.

Mr. UMSTEAD. I thought the gentleman was seeking information. Evidently he does not have any about this subject. If he is asking a question I shall answer it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I do not claim to have all of the information or to be an expert.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Neither do I.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I did ask the gentleman for information in the committee and have endeavored to be courteous.

Mr. UMSTEAD. I am seeking to be courteous. The gentleman has asked a question and refuses to give me an opportunity to answer it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I will let the gentleman answer it in his own time, as my time is very brief.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Very well.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I have asked the question a number of times as to whether or not this committee, this Congress, is going to be a policy-making committee or whether we will let some retired naval officers, some self-appointed authorities, tell this Congress whether we want to spend \$140,000,000 for these floating palaces, or whether this Congress would not consider it a more practical policy to construct 1,000 or more bombers or construct airplane carriers similar to the one I visited and went entirely through recently near the mouth of the Chesapeake Bay.

For my part, I propose to exercise my own judgment. I am perfectly willing that all Members of this body exercise his own judgment with reference to this perplexing question of what constitutes real national defense.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia and Mr. UMSTEAD rose.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. When we vote this bill we fix the policy. The gentleman has the privilege of casting his vote to fix the policy. It is merely suggested in the bill as a recommendation. We fix the policy; the Navy Department has nothing whatever to do with the policy.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Oh, but we were told that the committee took the judgment of the naval authorities, that the committee did not know whether we needed battleships, but that it simply took as law and gospel the word of these great naval authorities.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is good authority.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. It may be. But I reserve the right to exercise my own judgment in advocating the strengthening of the Air Service rather than spending \$140,000,000 for only two battleships.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is the object of this debate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is correct, and we may have more to say about it in the future.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes; if the gentleman will give me a little more time.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma. That will be plenty of time for the gentleman to answer my question.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Oklahoma yield to the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes; I yield with pleasure to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Has the gentleman ever been on and through a battleship?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I made it very plain at the outset that I do not pose as an authority. I was on a battleship more than once during the World War.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Did not the gentleman tell me less than 20 minutes ago that he had never been through a battleship?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes, and that is correct. I have never inspected a great battleship, although I did go all

through one of our latest airplane carriers that takes more than 100 planes. But it is true that I have never gone through a battleship.

Mr. UMSTEAD. How does the gentleman know it is a palace if he has never been through one?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. May I suggest that I do not see the importance of the gentleman's question or what that has to do with the question at issue. Having crossed the Atlantic only a few times I am not posing as an authority. But I again state that I have been in and on battleships here and abroad and have talked with real authorities as to their actual value as a matter of national defense.

Mr. UMSTEAD. The gentleman walked across one?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I think it is wholesome for this Committee and this Congress to have the gentleman from Oklahoma stand in the well, whether he be a technical expert or not, and say to this Congress and to the United States that which we are increasingly becoming aware of, that the scene of warfare has shifted and today it is in the air.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I am very much interested in the gentleman's remarks in reference to the retirement of men 38 years of age. I hope the gentleman will offer some suggestion as to what should be done with reference to men who have served 20 years going on the retired list.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I shall be glad to do so. The gentleman awhile ago said the reason for it was to induce men to join the Navy. According to the gentleman's theory if a sufficient number of young men do not join the Navy now as fast as he thinks they should, then the retirement age might be lowered to 28 instead of 38, or reduce the requirement to 10 years' service. If the gentleman will read the Record he will see that I have stated many times that I did not believe that anyone ought to be permitted to retire from the Navy, the Army, or any other governmental service with retired pay under 30 years of service or under 60 years of age. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I am sure it is not necessary for me to tell the House that I have never built a battleship, that I have never operated a battleship, or that I have never sunk a battleship; I, certainly, am not an expert. I do not, however, want my folks at home to be misled by my position on this; and I simply want to say that through sheer dead reckoning I come to the conclusion that whatever we appropriate in this bill for the purpose of building capital ships will be for the purpose not only of protecting the three Americas—North, Central, and South America—but also to protect those interests which we term the British Empire, which circle the globe.

I am very sincere in this because I have all the evidence I want that the United States is moving as rapidly toward war as a country peacefully minded possibly could move. If I vote for this bill I certainly expect I am voting for capital ships to carry on warfare in foreign waters. I want my people at home to know I feel that way about the situation.

Two or three questions were raised awhile ago by the gentleman from Wisconsin and the gentleman from Illinois with reference to the increased cost of battleships, which questions were very interesting to me. The only way I know to measure that is to come down to a little simple boiler, for instance, or the increase in the cost of building a boiler, a threshing machine, or an automobile. Those costs I know something about. For your information, let us take 1923 as



an average of 100. The hourly wages in October and November 1937 ran something like this: Agricultural implements, 144 percent of the 1923 wage; automobiles, 147 percent; electrical manufacturing, 137 percent; iron and steel, 139 percent; lumber and mill work, 141 percent; printing and news magazines, 135 percent; foundry work, 126 percent.

When you get into an analysis of the cost of manufacturing you will not be surprised to see why the cost of building a capital ship has jumped from around \$52,000,000 to approximately \$70,000,000. If you will permit me to make another observation, I think before the present keels you are about to lay down are completed, you will find that the battleship will not cost one penny less than \$85,000,000. How is that for an estimate by a nonexpert? Do not fool yourselves about these increased costs in industry because the program we have in operation at the present time, a program which is gathering speed as it moves along, must greatly and materially increase the cost over and above what we are paying today. Go out and talk to the industries in your district. Get them to show you their cost sheets, their time studies, and all that goes along with it and you will not be surprised at these increased costs of fifteen or twenty million dollars on a big battleship. How many men do they carry?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. About 1,500.

Mr. CRAWFORD. They carry 1,500 men on a battleship. What is that? It is a good-sized town.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The percentage of cost just given to the Committee is interesting. What does the gentleman think has produced that additional cost other than the various laws that the Congress has passed?

Mr. CRAWFORD. There is not another single factor that has contributed as much to the increased cost as has the legislative acts of this Congress right here. I am very, very positive about that. Of course, the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee may disagree with me.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I agree with the gentleman. In other words, such laws as the Walsh-Healey Act necessarily increase the cost of all Government building operations.

Mr. CRAWFORD. They must.

Mr. Chairman, I want to refer to another thing. Let us take a report of the subcommittee of the Ways and Means Committee on the tax bill which is about to be sent to us. On page 69 of that report you will find an outline in the form of a recommendation that will come to us within a few days which will add tremendously to the cost of operating the industries of this country. This is in a tax bill, if you please. The recommendation brings in a new factor we have not dealt with before. They call it a consent-dividend credit. You may wonder what that has to do with battleships, but it has this much to do with it: The defense of our country depends, of course, partially on an efficient Navy. The building and maintenance of an adequate Navy, in turn, depends, first, upon our economic system, resting upon private enterprise; and, secondly, that private enterprise operating on a profitable basis, giving a net income which can be taxed in order to bring revenue to the Government with which to build the Navy.

For a few minutes I desire to discuss the report of the subcommittee of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. Chairman, let us assume this gentleman here is the head of a corporation, and you are his stockholder. This report provides if his corporation desires to escape the burden of the undistributed-earnings tax, he shall go out and secure from each of the stockholders an affidavit under oath to the effect that when you make your personal tax return you will include in the tax return the amount of your pro rata share as represented by your certificates of stock which his corporation has earned and not sent to you in the form of a declared dividend. In other words, they call it a consent-dividend credit. Then after he has received one of those affidavits from 100 percent of his stockholders, whether you have 5 stockholders or 5,000 stockholders, to the effect

they will carry out that intent in their tax return, he may file that, and his corporation will escape the burden of an undistributed-earnings tax.

What is that going to do to increase the cost of doing business, which will certainly be reflected in the cost of the machinery, steel, woodwork, and every other kind of a gadget or trinket that human ingenuity can design to make a battleship more effective? I took this matter up with the Treasury Department, and I asked them this question: Suppose corporation A fails to get one affidavit out of six or seven hundred stockholders? In that case the whole thing collapses. Just imagine a factor of that kind being injected into the proposal. That is one of the modifications in the undistributed-earnings tax which will be presented to us.

There is one other thing I want to touch on before my time expires. Every day in going about my work I keep asking myself the question: What in the world is the matter with the men on the production line in the factory?

What has caused this tremendous upset in American labor? I believe about 99 percent of the ills of this country today can be traced directly to the troubled mind of the man at the bench, in the shop, on the production line, out in the garage, or wherever you may find him. What is the cause of it? What has terribly upset this man? We called the so-called big fellows of business down here, and what have they said about what is going on in the mind of the man who works at the bench? I wish to the God of Heaven we could get the worker himself down here to talk to our committee instead of the captains of big industry. If it is the man who performs the labor who is giving the trouble, then let us get him down here and find out what he has to say about the matter.

I certainly do not desire to condemn this man, because if I were out on the production line I would be wondering about some of the profound changes which are taking place in American industry. You think of large units today. When you bring great masses of machinery and building material together in the form of a completed plan with standard machines installed you immediately have a demand for what they call scientific management. If this scientific management is put to work along with the machinery, you begin to turn out at the other end of the factory what is known as mass production, which is a combination of capital, men, machinery, buildings, scientific management, and so forth. As you move into these big aggregations of men and capital, the worker loses contact with the boss. He gets no chance to give full expression to his life, as you have a chance to give full expression to your life in the Halls of Congress, down at the hotel, out with your friends, out in public gatherings, or wherever you may be. He also finds that special-purpose machines are being adopted in place of general-purpose machines, and this cuts down his ability to spread out his own creative forces and give expression to his life. He finds the job is less educational as the machines are introduced. The worker also finds he is gradually becoming an agent of the planner, the scientific manager.

This is one reason I rebel so much against the idea of a central staff sitting in Washington planning American agriculture and planning American industry for the privates who will be engaged out there on the farms and in the factories, because the Government planning we are doing in a way duplicates and robs the people of the very thing of which big industry in this country today unintentionally robs the individual worker.

The supervising job is becoming more and more exacting. This causes the management to bring in college graduates as supervisors and discard the man who has been in the factory for 10 or 15 years, thinking he was working up to a job of responsibility. Young college men are brought in, and it naturally makes the regular worker feel there is no chance for advancement in spite of all the years he has spent in preparing for the operation of the business. In turn, the worker believes this trend is leading to the formation of a very definite labor class; in other words, it is crowding him out of the class which you term the non-labor class. Then he is becoming more and more dependent upon management for his income and his job.

Mr. VOORHIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS. I am much interested in what the gentleman is saying. Does it not follow there is an increasing amount of insecurity for the individual worker under such circumstances?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I do not believe there is any question about it.

Mr. VOORHIS. Is not one of the facts the gentleman has shown that the development of our economic order as it goes forward means a greater and greater insecurity for the individual?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Certainly it does.

Mr. VOORHIS. Then is it not necessary that government, as the agent of the people, generally should take certain steps to protect those individuals under such circumstances?

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is a matter I am coming to.

What are some of the things the worker has lost as this trend has developed? I make these remarks as one who has spent 20 years prior to coming here in so-called big industry in this country. I love it. If I am anything in the world, I am what you would call a productionist. I love the idea of production and I loathe anything which interferes with it.

The worker has lost his direct and intimate contact with the manager of the business. The situation makes the worker the master of one or a few machines and deprives him of the chance to be a versatile craftsman, and this narrows the market for his services in case of a great economic shake-up and certainly makes him feel more insecure.

The worker is placed more or less at the mercy of subordinates in management, which makes it more difficult for him to appeal to the chief for correction of the difficulties which exist, and makes it more possible for the subordinate to inject into the administration of the labor personnel policies the management of the company does not want injected into it at all.

The worker's chance for promotion is narrowed by the same forces which reduce his skill. Further, he becomes more dependent upon management for increased wages and promotion to greater responsibility, while at the same time he becomes less likely to contact management personally. He finds jobs are vanishing in the wake of a powerful force which deprives him of his position, and at the same time raises the standards of living of his fellows, and this all tends to lead to a feeling of insecurity.

These devastating forces are moving toward him and forcing him to cling tenaciously to that which he holds in his hands today. When you go to him and say, "My friend, can you not realize there are great expanding markets and in due course the standard of living of all the people on earth will become higher and higher and higher?" he realizes at the same moment it does not pay his December 1937 grocery bill or rent cost, and this is the thing about which he is concerned today.

It seems to me the labor leadership must solve this problem working in conjunction with government and assisting in every way it can. If the individual heads of American enterprises—and when I use the word "enterprises" I mean those enterprises which are established and operated for the purpose of making a profit—can fully comprehend their responsibility in this picture, I believe there is hope some good may come out of all this. Unless the heads of industry accept that responsibility and proceed to work it out themselves, I am afraid of the future. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BINDERUP].

Mr. BINDERUP. Mr. Chairman, continuing my remarks from page 240, Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, referring to H. R. 8585, former number H. R. 7627, a bill for monetary control by the Government, in the various appropriation bills this Congress will be asked to pass upon in this session, nothing is as unfair and unjust, as ridiculous and absurd, as corrupt and demoralizing, nor a greater reflection

on the intelligence of Congress than are the items included as interest on the public debt.

According to President Roosevelt's Budget statement, this item lacks only a few dollars, comparatively speaking, of being a billion dollars. In fact, when including cost of administration, commissions, renewals, and other items of expense, it amounts to over a billion dollars.

Is not it strange that we are startled and alarmed over one item in the appropriation bill we are considering on the floor today, namely, the building of two battleships at about \$60,000,000 apiece? How strange that we should be alarmed and startled over so small a matter, comparatively, when we are paying the bankers of the Nation for the unreasonable, unnecessary, and foolish privilege of creating the Nation's money, with a fountain pen, no less than \$1,000,000,000 a year in interest, or enough to build 17 such battleships each year. Strange that we should be startled over so small a matter when we have paid the bankers in this unreasonable privilege of creating the Nation's money with a fountain pen, since the year 1933—and that is only 5 years ago—no less than \$12,000,000,000, which, with the yearly interest added, would have built no less than 200 battleships like the 2 that are contemplated in this bill before the House today.

But all this, unfortunately for the people, is water gone over the mill. It is people's money wasted, foolishly and criminally, and I challenge the world to deny it. The only return it can possibly give to the people is in the profit of experience, and unless we profit by this it is 100 percent wasted.

I have placed in the lobby to the Hall of the House of Representatives five charts pertaining to monetary control and providing the plan to eliminate this crime in the future against the American people, a plan to take away from the bankers their fountain pen and to restore to the people their constitutional right that Congress, and Congress only, shall coin all money and regulate the value thereof. In other words, create the people's medium of exchange.

I am grateful for this extraordinary privilege to place these charts in the lobby, as I recognize these charts are extremely large—25 feet in length and 8 feet high. Today is the last day these charts will appear in the lobby, and I invite your careful consideration, and hope you will allow me 1 hour on the floor of the House within the next 10 days with these charts to explain this plan. I hope for more than that. I hope that you will honor me by being in the House at that time, that you will give me your attention that I may explain this plan definitely. I want to answer every inquiry relative to the money question. I want to challenge every effort to discredit any principles included in this plan. I want this plan safe and sound where it protects the creditor just as well as the debtor, and prevents inflation just as well as deflation. I know there can be no criticism from the Republican side of the House because they have declared themselves so emphatically in their platform of 1932, in which they embodied every principle of this plan by saying:

We will return to the Congress the authority lodged with it by the Constitution of the United States that provides Congress shall coin all money and regulate the value thereof.

I know objection cannot possibly come from the Democratic side for the reason that for the last 35 years they have been promising the people just exactly such a plan as is incorporated in the bill I introduced in Congress, H. R. 8585, and the Democrats said—the last time was in 1936 in their platform—that was the last time they had an opportunity to make a declaration:

We approve the objective of a permanent sound currency, so stabilized as to prevent the former wide fluctuations in value which injured in turn the producers, debtors, and property owners on the one hand, and wage earners and creditors on the other, a currency which will permit full utilization of the country's resources.

I know there can be no objection from the Progressive Party, because they declared themselves in their platform in 1936 as follows:

Credit and money should be controlled by the people through Government-owned central banks which will make the monopoly of credit and money in private hands impossible.



And there is the Farmer-Labor platform, perfectly loyal to every principle, for they also said in 1936:

Congress shall exercise the exclusive and constitutional power to coin money and regulate the value thereof.

I know our good President Roosevelt will welcome a bill embodying the principles of H. R. 8585, because he said those immortal words in his famous message to the London Monetary Conference:

Let me be frank in saying that the United States seeks the kind of a dollar which a generation hence will have the same purchasing power and debt-paying power as the dollar value we hope to attain in the near future. That objective means more to the good of other nations than a fixed ratio for a month or two in terms of the pound or the franc.

The plan incorporated in H. R. 8585, a bill for monetary control, is not original with the author, for it was the plan of Thomas Jefferson and John Adams, of Andrew Jackson, Abraham Lincoln, James G. Blaine, William Jennings Bryan, and Woodrow Wilson, and of every student of the monetary question on the face of the earth who has ever offered a solution to the unfair and unreasonable situation of poverty in the midst of plenty, a remedy for the maldistribution of the great natural resources God Almighty gave that all might enjoy. I say all of these have agreed on the principles contained in the bill for monetary control that I hope to have the privilege of explaining definitely from the bottom and up to this assembly in the near future. [Applause.]

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from Indiana [Mrs. JENCKES].

Mrs. JENCKES of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

#### MONETARY POLICIES

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, it is my belief that the Government should try a change in monetary policies in order to get us out of the present recession. Practically everything else has been tried and proven to be unsuccessful.

#### MONEY AS A VEHICLE JUST AS NECESSARY AS BOXCARS

The way I view it if we had only one-half enough boxcars to transport the production to the consumers there would be a disequilibrium that would cause the consumers to have to do without on account of the insufficient number of boxcars. Money as a circulating medium is just as necessary as boxcars. After you get the production to within reach of the consumers, if they do not have and cannot obtain a circulating medium which will enable them to acquire this production, they are just as bad off, for all practical purposes, as if the production had not been conveyed to within their reach.

So it is my view the Government should immediately consider monetary means of bringing this country out of this recession. There are two or three ways this can be done.

#### A 100-PERCENT INCREASE RESERVE REQUIREMENT A MISTAKE

I believe Mr. Marriner S. Eccles is a conscientious, honest, sincere person wanting to do what he believes is right in the interest of this Government and in the interest of the country, but I believe, whether he intended it or not, he caused this recession when he and the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve Board increased by 100 percent the reserve requirements of the banks. This was just the same as plowing under or placing in the vaults and locking up, so no one could use it, billions of dollars of money that would have been available to the American people. This was the first thing that was done.

#### STERILIZATION OF GOLD POLICY ALSO A MISTAKE

The next thing was the sterilizing of gold. Here we are with more than \$12,000,000,000 of gold, \$2 in gold for every dollar we have in circulation, a 200-percent gold reserve.

England stayed on the gold standard for 100 years with only a 10-percent gold reserve. No country has ever contended, no economist has ever contended that any nation should have more than 40 percent of gold reserve. Not only have we more than 100 percent, but as gold has been brought into this country we have sterilized it. We have borrowed credit from the banks to place this gold out of circulation, sterilizing it, placing it into disuse. It is inactive, it is idle, it is unused. This was the second thing that was done that has been hurtful and damaging to the credit system of this country. I believe that gold should have money issued upon it, at least 100 cents on the dollar, and this money placed in the channels of trade and distribution.

If we furnish this money to people who already have plenty of purchasing power, it will not cause any extra purchases to be made, but if the money can be placed into hands where it will be used to buy the comforts and necessities of life, it will go into the proper channels, and with its velocity this country will be greatly aided and assisted. One way this can be done is through the W. P. A. There are other ways it can be done.

#### MISTAKES SHOULD BE CORRECTED

So I believe that two things can be done now. One is to change the reserve requirements of the banks and the other is to desterilize that gold. In other words, correct the two obvious mistakes that were made.

I know the argument is made, and the question asked, If you desterilize gold and we are called upon by other countries for the gold, what are we going to do? The answer is simple. We have a gold stabilization fund of \$2,000,000,000 now. We have plenty of gold and will have during your lifetime and mine to satisfy any demand of any foreign country for gold. So that is not a serious objection and it should not be considered.

#### PARITY PRICES TO FARMERS

Another way this money could be placed in circulation would be to grant the farmers parity prices for their products. They have been promised a fair price.

They were promised that in 1932; they were promised it in 1936. The party in power making those promises has not carried them out. I know that sincere efforts were made by the administration to carry them out, but those efforts were unsuccessful. You know and I know that the farm bill that is pending in conference is going to be a disappointment.

#### EIGHT CENTS AN HOUR LABOR ON FARMS

We know that it will mean about 8-cent cotton and other farm commodities in proportion for this year, and 8-cent cotton for next year. That means 8-cent labor, 8 cents an hour. It takes an hour's labor to produce a pound of cotton. So here we are doing nothing for one-third of our population that represents enough of the American market to cause a panic if they cannot buy, and that represents enough of the market to cause prosperity if they are able to buy the simple comforts and necessities of life that they should have. So we should provide parity prices for farmers. It is right that they get parity prices, and I insist that this promise that was made to the people be carried out. It is in the interest of the people in the cities that these promises be carried out. If the farmers are able to buy, they can purchase what is made and offered to them for sale by other classes and groups in all sections of the Nation and in all States and the principal cities. If they do not, and their buying power stops, then the population of the cities suffers along with them.

#### PURCHASING POWER AMONG MASSES

I consider the major problem is monetary. I also consider industrialists are absolutely helpless to revive conditions unless you first revive the purchasing power among the masses of the people. What can they do to bring business back unless the consumers are able to buy? First you have to move the goods, and in order to move the goods you have to have purchasing power out among the masses.

Mr. VOORHIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes.

Mr. VOORHIS. Does not the gentleman believe that it likewise follows that in order to get an expansion of capital goods you must first have a demand for consumer goods in order that the producers of consumer goods will have sufficient confidence so that they will invest in capital?

Mr. PATMAN. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

#### LOCAL BUSINESS INSTEAD OF ABSENTEE OWNERSHIP

The major problem is monetary. Another problem is parity prices to the farmer, to furnish one-third of our population the buying power that they are entitled to. The next is local ownership of business, the kind of business that people in every community can conduct and operate themselves. I remember, and other gentlemen will remember, when there was distress in a community, a small town, there was a sufficient number of people in that community to afford employment and to grant relief when necessary to take care of the local situation. But along came absentee ownership, and absentee ownership comes in competition with local business, and absentee ownership soon destroys that great cushion of the local community to take care of its own problems by destroying that local community cushion, and a relief roll has become necessary, absolutely necessary, and there is no cushion there any more. So one of the major problems is to take issue against absentee ownership of a business that can be operated by local people. Local people cannot operate every business. They cannot operate the railroads or possibly the telephone lines, and there are many lines of business that local people cannot operate, but there are lines of business like retail distribution, where there are enough people in every community who are able and anxious and willing to carry on that business, and I believe it is our duty to give them that aid and encouragement by protecting them, the weak, the local businessman, against the strong, who are the absentee owners.

#### GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP OF THE 12 FEDERAL RESERVE BANKS

For the monetary bill I am insisting on H. R. 7230. Other bills are pending which will be considered, and possibly all at the same time. I am in favor of all views being considered. Mr. BINDERUP has views of his own, and so does the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] and others. I want the Banking and Currency Committee to consider all our views and let us report out some kind of a bill that will make an attack on the concentration of credit and money as mentioned by the President of the United States in his message to the Congress and in his speeches and statements to the newspapers.

#### HEARING BEFORE COMMITTEE SOUGHT

This is the only proposal, according to my view, that is pending in Congress that makes any step in the direction of carrying out what the President said he would like to see carried out. There are 160 Members of this House sponsoring that bill, H. R. 7230. They are the Democrats, and five of them are members of the Committee on Banking and Currency. In addition to them, all of the Progressives are supporting it and a large number of Republicans are supporting it. Many Democrats who are not cosponsors are supporting it, and we have been unable to even get a hearing before the Banking and Currency Committee. We are insisting upon it, and we expect to continue to insist upon it until we get that hearing. [Applause.]

#### BILL AGAINST ABSENTEE OWNERSHIP

For the bill on absentee ownership, a large group of Members of the House is working now on a measure intended to prevent a few people or a few corporations from obtaining a monopoly on retail distribution. It is going to be approached from an angle from which it can be successfully approached. If we can pass that bill, that means that local ownership will be encouraged and absentee ownership will be retarded. I believe that the bill will be ready in another week. I know of 100 Members of the House right now who are ready to place their names on such a bill.

#### PARITY PRICES FOR FARMERS INSISTED UPON

We are all working to the end that by giving the farmer a fair price for his products, that is, at least parity prices,

we will raise the purchasing power of one-third of our population and grant to them what can be and will be a fair annual living wage.

None of the farmers receive a fair annual wage; a large percentage of the people engaged in industry do enjoy a fair annual wage today—not all of them; some of them do not. I am in favor of raising the wages of the submerged groups and I will vote for a wage and hour bill if you will at the same time carry out that other provision of our platform which says parity prices or cost-of-production prices for the farmers of this country. How can you expect a Member from a rural district to vote for 40 cents an hour as the lowest wage in industry without any assurance that his farm constituency will receive more than 8 cents an hour for their labor?

All of these things are working in the direction that we should go, the direction of fair annual living wage for the American people, which I am in favor of for both industrial and agricultural workers.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from Texas in order that he may answer the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I wish to ask the gentleman two or three questions. Is the gentleman willing to state to the House that in his opinion the real leaders around here do somewhat believe that this monetary system is going to have to be dealt with quite shortly?

Mr. PATMAN. I find some of them feel that way. I do not know how the President feels about it, I do not know how his close advisers feel about it, but it is my belief that many of the people who are occupying the key positions in this administration believe that it is essential, absolutely necessary. The President's messages and statements indicate he is going to the mat with the money group, who oppose any change in our monetary policy. I believe he will. I predict now that he will drive the money changers from the temple and do it just as courageously and effectively as he has carried out other major proposals. The President is with the people. He is fighting the special-privilege groups and fighting for the masses. I feel confident that he will come to the conclusion that our major problem at this time is monetary and absolutely necessary for recovery.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I was getting that same impression from remarks I have heard. Like the gentleman from Texas, I have been wondering why hearings did not begin on some of these bills.

Mr. PATMAN. Let me say there that when we have another hearing—and the gentleman is a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency—that I, as one member of the committee, will insist, and I hope the gentleman will join me, in calling not only Mr. Eccles from the Federal Reserve Board but we should call every member of the Board. Let us see what the other members think about this problem; let us call these people in the key positions before that committee.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I am very anxious to have that done. Let me ask one further question with reference to the different methods or steps that could be taken. The gentleman mentioned releasing money through relief, the dewatering of gold, and changing the reserve requirements. These two last things, the changing of the reserve requirements and the dewatering of gold, do not involve any taxation or relieve the expenditures in any way.

Mr. PATMAN. No extra taxes, no bonds, no extra expense. I think Mr. Eccles was mistaken when he thought inflation was approaching this country and caused the reserve requirements to be raised. I could not see any signs of inflation, and I believe he admitted that he could not name a single sign existing; yet they went ahead and doubled the reserve requirement on the banks of this Nation; that had



the result of plowing under, or destroying, billions of dollars of the circulating medium.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Does the gentleman feel that there was a single sign on the horizon at the time which indicated speculation or an excess of the price index, especially when we take into consideration the agreement that was made with Great Britain and France in September of 1936 wherein we agreed to go along on certain propositions with reference to maintaining a high price index?

Mr. PATMAN. I see no danger of inflation at all.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PIERCE].

#### COLUMBIA RIVER DEVELOPMENT

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Chairman, the outstanding material achievement of the Roosevelt administration is the construction of two colossal, multipurpose dams at Bonneville and Grand Coulee on the Columbia River. The Grand Coulee Dam in Washington is a joint irrigation and power structure. The Bonneville Dam, near Portland, Oreg., will afford navigation and power facilities. These two dams will revolutionize the industrial and economic conditions of the Northwest—Oregon, Washington, and Idaho. They will usher in a new westward movement, such as we had before our national frontiers vanished at the water's edge of the Pacific Ocean. Their completion will mark a new era for the entire Nation in opening opportunities for the land-hungry of the cities and for the drought-stricken farmers. Both these groups look to our Pacific Northwest for their new day of land ownership on self-sustaining irrigated farms. The entire Nation will also benefit from the operation of the "yardstick" by which electric light and power rates will be measured. Electric consumers look to the West for this important contribution.

#### THE RIVER

The Columbia River is the second largest in the United States. It is more than 2,000 miles long, from its source amid the eternal glaciers of the snow-capped Rockies to ocean level. This mighty river, with its watershed and adjacent areas, has over 50 percent of all the undeveloped hydroelectric power in the United States. It affords the greatest opportunity for electric power development anywhere in the world. Its falling waters are well named "white coal," and they afford rich compensation for the lack of abundant deposits of coal, oil, and gas not yet found in commercial quantities in the Northwest. The waters of the Columbia, when chained and harnessed for the production of hydroelectric energy, will be more valuable than all the anthracite beds of Pennsylvania, the bituminous coal beds of Illinois, or the oil and gas fields of Texas. This immense quantity of power and energy will not be depleted with time, but will endure so long as water flows, far outlasting the diminishing natural resources of other sections of the country. The Northwest has 40 percent of all the commercial standing timber of the United States. This is also being made a permanent asset through the sustained yield plan of cutting, now being developed through the wisdom of this administration. Our wheat fields, our fisheries, our fruit orchards, yield in abundance. This fertile Columbia Basin is a land of temperate climate, ideally fitted for the habitation of civilized man, for those who love home and the land.

#### IRRIGATION FARMING

The stupendous Grand Coulee Dam is primarily an irrigation project. It will make it possible to pump water over a million and a quarter acres, constituting the greatest single irrigation project in all the land. Cheap electricity for pumping water onto now barren lands will come not only from Grand Coulee, but also from other power plants in the Columbia Basin, which will make available thousands of acres of rich land, freed from dependence upon the uncertainties of rainfall. It is clearly within the facts to state that this development will afford at least 100,000 new homes, on irrigated lands, where farming may be conducted under ideal conditions. These projects will affect directly the lives of

a million or more people, and indirectly react helpfully upon the entire Nation. In this land economic refugees will find new homes where they may raise the things they eat and produce abundantly for commerce. The new westward movement has already begun and with it has come a revival of the pioneer spirit. Those who have seen the irrigated tracts of the Yakima Valley in Washington, or of the Klamath and Malheur countries of Oregon, are convinced of the value and desirability of irrigation farming. Here is our opportunity to place the landless man on the manless land.

#### NAVIGATION AND TRANSPORTATION

The Columbia and Snake Rivers form a natural transportation route by water through the very center of the Northwest. The foresight of the President has made possible not only irrigation and power development but also water transportation which will carry inland-empire products to the ports of the world. There is a great program ahead for the Columbia River region, including the Snake River. The next dam will undoubtedly be constructed at Umatilla Rapids, making slack water to the mouth of the Snake River, and providing water navigation for the transportation of products from adjacent lands irrigated by the Grand Coulee projects. Gates of the highest single locks of the world swung open a few days ago for the first passage of a river boat through the Bonneville ship locks, given us by the President. Soon ocean-going vessels will follow the lead of the river craft, and penetrate to the inland seaport of The Dalles, 200 miles from the ocean. Eventually there will be navigable water on the Columbia and Snake Rivers for 600 miles. Thus, water transportation, supplemented by trucks moving over the remarkably fine highway systems of the Northwest, will help to regulate and keep within bounds the rates of the railroads, which have exacted such a heavy toll from our producers.

#### REPAYMENTS TO THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

The electricity generated at Bonneville and Grand Coulee is a byproduct of these multipurpose dams. Navigation will bear its reasonable portion of the cost of Bonneville, and sale of electric power there generated will repay to the Federal Government that portion of the cost of the dam which may be fairly charged to the hydroelectric power system. The farmers who use the Grand Coulee water for irrigation will repay a reasonable portion of the expense of the creation of that monumental structure. Our President has often said that the power development on the Columbia River was intended for the widest possible use at the lowest rates which would repay the Government for its investment.

#### THE YARDSTICK

The President has on many occasions expressed his belief that the power developments on the Columbia River would afford a yardstick by which the people of the Nation could measure their electric costs and judge for themselves whether they were being overcharged for electric power. The Government projects will be carefully conducted and studied for the purpose of deciding definitely what should be the cost of hydrogeneration and of the transmission of such current, the two factors which, added to local distribution costs, make the total cost of delivering electricity to the consumer. To illustrate the yardstick principle I may state that, measured by the prices paid by the people who use the publicly owned power plant at Tacoma, Wash., users of electricity in Oregon are paying more than seven and a half million dollars annually—\$7,785,496—in excess of what they would pay for electric energy if they were charged at the Tacoma rates. The Tacoma yardstick also reveals that the people of the State of Washington pay annually twelve and a half millions—\$12,530,290—more than they would pay if all their people might have the Tacoma rates. Idaho is paying each year over three and a quarter millions—\$3,290,993—too much, measured by the Tacoma yardstick. The millions of dollars which could be saved annually by reduction of electric rates of the Northwest to the Tacoma standard would buy out and pay for every local distributing system in that area within the next 10 years. The Tacoma yardstick and

the yardstick afforded by Ontario, Canada, measure our national electric excess charges at a colossal amount, which would pay the national debt in 21 years.

#### DEBT REDEMPTION

The only raw material which enters into the manufacture of hydroelectricity is falling water. Lower electric rates do not cost the producer more, and they greatly increase the long hour consumption of the product. There is little labor entering into generating costs, and the transmission lines are of long-time construction. The greater spread of use brings greater profits and lower consumer costs. These profits are, in publicly owned plants, used to redeem debts, so that rates may be further reduced when initial costs have been entirely paid. This debt-redemption feature is another lesson we have learned, added to the "yardstick," to justify in the fullest sense these great national undertakings in the power field. The privately owned utilities pile debt on debt, and by their policy of debt refunding cripple posterity and keep rates at exorbitantly high levels. The Nation needs the electric "yardstick," and it needs the lesson of debt-redeeming utilities.

#### PUBLIC OWNERSHIP

It is an axiom as old as time that business which does not admit of competition should be owned and controlled by the public. A private monopoly is as indefensible today as it was in the days of Plato, of Jefferson, or of Bryan. Electrical distribution is a natural monopoly because it does not admit of competition, if public welfare is considered. Furthermore, it uses natural resources and public facilities like roads and streets, which are public and not private assets. No municipality can afford to have competing systems providing the necessities upon which people are dependent, such as water, light, and power. No city in a civilized country can exist without an abundance of these requisites, which should be furnished at the lowest possible price. No argument can justify the conduct of such a business by a private individual, company, or corporation. For necessities of life, people should not be left to the mercies of profit-seeking corporations, neither should absentee speculators be allowed to gamble with such projects. So successful have been the publicly owned utilities that some cities have come to rely upon them for the income necessary to maintain other activities of municipal government. Certainly it should not be expected that the water and light systems should assume this burden. When the income from them has paid off the initial investment the rates should be reduced to the minimum. Fortunate indeed are the citizens who may use without stint an abundant supply of electric current.

#### REGULATION A FAILURE

For some years our public life has been dominated by those who have advocated private ownership of electric utilities, supposed to be controlled by public regulation through State agencies. My observation has convinced me that State public utility commissions, whether elective or appointive, have proven ineffectual. Powerful Wall Street groups have secured financial control of local operating companies, and through their great accumulations of profits, never applied to debt redemption, have got a stranglehold on legislative and regulative bodies. The worst evil which has developed from private ownership of utilities has been their use for speculative purposes, resulting in the control of these essentials by holding companies existing solely for the exploitation of the people and frequently resulting in ruining the operating companies. The regulators have submitted to regulation until they have become simply adjuncts of the private utilities. The only effective regulation in any business is competition, and this is impossible when the business should be conducted as a natural monopoly without duplicating systems.

Admitting the failure of attempted regulation of these great corporations, we may gain some control over rates charged by the private electric power companies through the "yardstick" method. It is my judgment that the ultimate solution is public ownership. The people must own not only generating plants and transmission lines but also the local distribution systems. National or State Governments should

build and operate the generating plants located on the waterways which they control. They should carry the current on public transmission lines to the municipalities or communities, which should own their own distribution systems.

#### ACQUISITION OF PRIVATE SYSTEMS

Our Pacific Northwest States of Washington, Idaho, and Oregon, which will use the electric current from the Columbia River dams, will undoubtedly pass laws making it possible for the people to acquire existing electric distributing systems by paying their present owners reasonable prices, based on "prudent investment." Cities should at once take the necessary steps under existing laws to ascertain the values of privately owned municipal distributing systems. Private utilities should not expect to be paid for franchises which were, in most instances, given them by the very people who are now proposing to purchase the plants. Inclusion of severance charges should not be allowed as an excuse for enormous excess payments, neither should the public be expected to pay for its own "good will." Actual values of poles, transformers, wires, and equipment should be arrived at by honest, disinterested engineers who know these values. No advocate of public ownership desires to confiscate private property, even if it were legally possible, as it is not. The owners and investors should have a fair return for actual investment prudently handled. Few cities tolerate private water systems, and in the coming years they will require the private utilities to retire from the field of generating, transmitting, and distributing electric light and power. There will be a particularly strong sentiment for public ownership in the Pacific Northwest, because of the abundant hydroelectric sites, and the construction of these great dams on the Columbia River. We have allowed private utilities to collect millions of dollars from our most valuable natural resource, the falling waters of our rivers, while we have been learning the lesson of public ownership of all our natural resources.

If the resistance to orderly progress becomes so bitter that the private utility interests place unfair obstructions in the path of public ownership, municipalities must be given authority, by statute law or constitutional amendment, if necessary, to take over the distributing plants at actual value. The cities must then be allowed to pay for these electric utilities with serial bonds, running through a term of years, drawing a reasonable rate of interest and liquidated by the earnings from the plants.

#### INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT IN THE NORTHWEST

What an era of development has been opened by these two great dams upon this mighty Columbia River! The ultimate energy capacity of the two structures is only about one-sixth of that available on the streams of the Northwest. The most potent influences in establishing industries in New England, after the Revolutionary War, were rivers like the Merrimac, from which our ancestors obtained power by use of their crude water wheels. The coal beds were the main reason for the establishment of industries in western Pennsylvania. The greatest influence in bringing industry and prosperity to the Pacific Northwest will be the cheap electric power from developments on the Columbia River and the streams of its watershed. This opportunity for new industries at and near tidewater, excels that offered in any other region. Think what the situation will be when the Government has been repaid for its power investment in dams and transmission lines, and the debts have been lifted from the distributing systems. What will then be the factors which will enter into the cost of electric energy in the Pacific Northwest? Chiefly falling water, with electric rates so astonishingly low that it will make this section an ideal place for home, for farm, and for industry. In another generation marvelous changes will come over this favored region, which will then have amortized the costs of these noteworthy improvements which will furnish light, power, and heat. When President Roosevelt allotted the necessary millions to start the dams on the Columbia River at Grand Coulee and at Bonneville, he initiated a new era for the Pacific Northwest.

Surely this generation will not commit the unpardonable crime of allowing the holding companies of Wall Street to



steal the hydroelectric power generated on our rivers. We of the Northwest will protect our natural heritage and we will acquire and maintain full ownership and control for ourselves and our descendants.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. PIERCE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DITTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PIERCE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DITTER. I want to compliment the gentleman for the very splendid speech he has made in defense of his own position. As he referred to the matter of coal in Pennsylvania, I wonder if he is familiar with the statement just made by Governor Earle with reference to Pennsylvania coal?

Mr. PIERCE. I am not familiar with it.

Mr. DITTER. And if the gentleman would give us the benefit of his opinion on what the Governor thinks of our coal proposition.

Mr. PIERCE. I am not familiar with his statement.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I desire to make a few remarks concerning the appropriation bill now pending before the Committee. I did not hear all of the discussion that took place in reference to the matter this afternoon, but I was very much impressed with the remarks made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and several others who followed him.

I have gone among my people, as has practically every other Member of this House, and I have told them I am in favor of adequate national defense. However, I have as great difficulty defining adequate defense as some of you. I recall that our first President, the Father of his Country, said that we should maintain a defensive posture. I have been trying to figure out what he meant by "defensive posture." I am not one to follow altogether a deductive system of reasoning, but when we have a great authority, such as the Father of his Country, I am willing to give a good deal of weight to his advice. I remember also that Thomas Jefferson stated that we should avoid entangling alliances. Washington said practically the same thing. That is our American doctrine.

Let us couple those two things together. As a national policy we ought to maintain a defensive posture and at the same time avoid entangling alliances. As I unite those two ideas, I get the impression that we should emphasize home protection and not the building of a navy that will reach into all parts of the world so that we might be able to whip any nation or a combination of nations wherever found. For this reason, Mr. Chairman, in considering this naval appropriation bill I prefer to minimize the construction of these floating fortresses and emphasize some other portions of our national defense.

Mr. PATMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. I am very much in sympathy with what the gentleman is saying, and at this time I would prefer to vote for an aerial force instead of battleships. But I would like to know who will offer the amendment and who is going to make the fight?

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. I prefer the same thing exactly, to strengthen our air force, and also anti-aircraft guns. Perhaps we had better get our heads together.

Mr. PATMAN. I hear a lot of sentiment in the cloak room, but I do not find anyone who is proposing an amendment along that line.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. It may be a case of belling the cat.

Mr. FADDIS. If the gentleman has any such idea in his mind, he wants to look over the record of the Battle of Jutland and also look over the operations in Spain with regard to how much confidence he can put in an air force.

Mr. PATMAN. What about the navy over in Spain?

Mr. FADDIS. The same thing would apply.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, may I say one more thing in this connection. I do not believe we can have an adequate national defense unless we get down to the grass roots of things. I appeared before the Military Affairs Committee of the House several months ago when the Faddis bill was under consideration wherein it was proposed we lay in a stock of strategic war materials, getting these materials from foreign nations. The suggestion was made at first that we take them in payment of the war debt. I could not reconcile several things in that regard.

In the first place, if we get manganese and tungsten, we get it from nations that owe us no war debt, or we may get it from Russia that never intends to pay any war debt. As a part of true national preparedness we ought not be caught as we were in the World War without a sufficient stock of strategic materials to provide for our artillery.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me essentially basic that we develop these strategic war materials within the confines of our own country. It may be necessary as a temporary proposition to get them wherever we can get them quickly, but where such a thing as manganese or tungsten is so vitally important to our military defense and equally vitally important to our industrial life, it stands to reason that we as a nation ought not to be dependent upon foreign sources for such strategic war materials and that we must develop these materials within our own limits.

I think we might do well therefore to discard or dispense with some auxiliary ship, at least a \$5,000,000 item or more, so that we may get these strategic war materials quickly, and when we develop them fully we should see that our own industrial machine is supplied through the home production of these things which are basically important to our Navy and to our Army.

Mr. Chairman, as a matter of national defense I prefer to emphasize military preparedness over and above naval preparedness, and I think that means home safety as well, so that if I am caught voting against any phase of this naval appropriation bill, I may also be found emphasizing military preparation to take the place of it.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. UMSTEAD. I take it the gentleman knows that the naval appropriation bill for the current year carried three and a half million dollars for the purpose of purchasing strategic and critical minerals to which the gentleman referred a few minutes ago.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Yes.

Mr. UMSTEAD. I also take it that the gentleman knows that \$3,000,000 is carried in the bill we are now considering for the same purpose.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. I notice that; but I wish it had been the sum provided in the House bill last year which was \$5,000,000. This was pared down to three and a half million dollars elsewhere. I think that sum is even too small.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Then the gentleman would undertake to say that some of the items in the bill which he considers to be too large should be used for purposes the gentleman thinks would be more useful?

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. UMSTEAD. The gentleman is not opposing the appropriation bill as we have it, then; he is merely opposing the arrangement of the items and the purposes for which the money is to be spent?

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. I would minimize the spending of money on battleships and use it on the Air Service or in some other more defensive way, including the furnishing of strategic materials and such like means of readiness.

However, I may say, in general, I favor strengthening the military arm of defense over the naval arm of defense. It is a question of emphasis.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to discuss the exportation of helium gas to Germany. If the members of the Committee will bear with me, I request I be not asked to yield until I conclude my remarks. Then, if time remains and I am asked to yield time to questions, I will gladly do so.

I hold in my hand an article dated November 23 from the Washington Post, which tells us that in the next war, and, in fact, in the present, motorized blimps will replace the stationary so-called sausage observation balloons of the last war. The ordinary commercial dirigible of the so-called German type, with which we have become familiar, takes about 7,000,000 cubic feet of gas to fill it. The helium necessary to float one of these dirigibles would fill about 80 war balloons of this latest type of maneuverable war balloons, which are equipped with motors and apparatus to make them readily maneuverable.

I further call your attention to this clipping from the New York Times of January 9:

GERMANY PLACES A BAN ON ROOSEVELT SPEECHES

LUCERNE, SWITZERLAND, January 8.—A Lucerne publishing firm, Vita Nova Verlag, announced today that its collection of speeches and official statements by President Roosevelt and former Premier Stanley Baldwin, translated into German, had been formally forbidden in Germany.

The German Government, according to the publishers, declared this volume was "unerwünscht" (undesirable), a word commonly used in many German towns to describe their attitude toward Jews.

It is believed here that this is the first time any western European government has barred official statements by the head of another state with which it maintains diplomatic relations.

You probably saw the current news items wherein it was reported that an official protest had been lodged against Mr. Dodd, former United States Ambassador to Germany, speaking his opinions freely in this country, where, thank God, we still have free speech about certain events, men, and conditions in Germany. May I read this clipping, I believe, from the New York Times which appeared in that newspaper—I think it was the New York Times, unfortunately it is unmarked as to its source—sometime in the last 30 to 90 days. You are Members of the Congress of the United States. Let me quote from this article and tell you what has happened to what I may call fellow colleagues of ours in Germany:

SOCIALIST EMIGRES DERIDE NAZI WRATH—COMPARE WHOLESALE MURDER OF DEPUTIES IN GERMANY WITH CZECH INCIDENT

Apropos of the uproar in the Nazi press over the alleged clubbing by the police of a couple of Henlein (pro-Nazi) members of the Czechoslovak Chamber of Deputies during a disturbance at Teplitz-Schoenau a few weeks ago, the executive committee of the Social Democratic Party of Germany, now living in exile in Prague, issued the following statement:

"Just think of the number of members of the German Reichstag who have suffered a much worse fate. Since the seizure of power by Adolf Hitler, the following deputies have been murdered: Eggerstedt, Ferkel, Gerdes, Goetz, Henk, Husemann, Jacobs, Kasten, Langhorst, Landgraf, Maeder, Dr. Marum, Putz, Reith, Dr. Sachs, Scheer, Schulz, Schuetz, Stelling, Steinfurth, and Stentzer.

"In none of these cases was the murderer ever brought to justice. "Among the numerous deputies held in jail without legal procedure, some of whom were grossly abused, we name—"

And here follows a list of a score or so of names.

In the New York Times with a Washington date line of December 6 appears the following:

An allotment of 17,900,000 cubic feet of helium has been granted by the Munitions Control Board to agents of the German Zeppelin Co., presumably for operation of the sister ship of the *Hindenburg* on a trans-Atlantic route.

The allotment is for the year beginning November 1, 1937, and was granted on November 23 to the American Zeppelin Transport, Inc., of New York, as agent for the German concern. No licenses have yet been applied for or issued under the allotment.

Similarly, in the Washington Evening Star of January 10, under a Houston, Tex., date line, appears the following:

The German steamer *Dessau* has arrived to load the first shipment of helium gas to be transported from the United States.

The steamer will take a portion of the 17,900,000 cubic feet of helium ordered for the LZ-30, sister ship of the ill-fated *Hindenburg*. The LZ-30 will be launched in about 5 months.

Aboard the *Dessau* are 468 steel bottles to be used as containers for the gas. The 2,350,000 cubic feet of gas to be placed aboard the vessel will virtually exhaust the supply in the Amarillo, Tex., plant.

I sent a wire to the President protesting against the shipment of helium out of our country, and the telegram was relayed to the Secretary of State, Mr. Hull.

May I read some excerpts from Mr. Hull's letter to me on that score, dated January 13, 1938?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Connecticut 2 additional minutes.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I am sorry I shall not have time to complete the whole story. I will have to skip over the letter which Mr. Hull wrote me and simply read excerpts from his letter—

On the joint recommendation of all members of the National Munitions Control Board and the Secretary of the Interior, the allotment of 17,900,000 cubic feet of helium gas—

And then he goes on to say that amount has been allotted just the way the newspaper articles to which I have referred have told us.

Then Mr. Hull's letter states that—

All requests for allotments of helium gas must be made under oath telling the purposes for which the gas is to be used.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that when a nation has broken its treaties, signed, sealed, and delivered supposedly in international good faith, when that same nation, or its representatives, come to us submitting a proposition under oath, I raise the question whether that proposition can be believed any better than the word of that nation which has been violated in connection with the broken international treaties.

Then Mr. Hull's letter further tells us that the Control Board, to which I have referred, is composed of the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Interior, and that all of these gentlemen must pass on such requests for helium and that such licenses are subject to revocation, I am pleased to say, without notice.

Then he goes on to state further:

The allotments mentioned above contemplate exports of helium gas which will extend over a period of 1 year.

And then he tells me that the gas not only is to inflate this dirigible initially but is to be enough to take the place of gas which may be lost due, I suppose, to evaporation or valving or the different things that take place in the mechanical operation of the dirigible which may cause it to lose gas.

I point this out because the gas allotment is not only enough initially for the dirigible or enough to fill, as I have pointed out, some 80 war machines of the type I have referred to, but a lot more gas which can fill additional war balloons as well.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I will yield if the gentleman will permit me to finish this one statement.

I may say, in closing, I think it is outrageous that the United States Government is giving to the nation of Germany one single cubic inch of helium gas. What has come over us in this country anyway? Are we so stupid in our international relations that we must surrender everything we have to foreign governments that break their word? What has come over us that our officials have so lost sight of their duty to the American people that they yield this God-given gift of helium to a foreign government which has shown itself to be one that breaks its international agreements, that murders members of its House of Deputies, colleagues of ours we might say, and yet give them this gas that can be converted into war-making machinery? I hope these licenses for allotments of helium gas will be revoked.



Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Yes.

Mr. FADDIS. I might inform the gentleman there was a bill passed in the House of Representatives last year granting this permission.

Mr. PHILLIPS. And I was here fighting against it, foreseeing just what I am speaking about now.

Mr. FADDIS. I was, too.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield.

Mr. DITTER. Does the gentleman suggest that the deletion of the Roosevelt speeches was due to the efforts of the economic royalists?

Mr. PHILLIPS. What does the gentleman think?

Mr. DITTER. I thought the gentleman might be able to answer.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. LUCKEY].

Mr. LUCKEY of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, we now have under consideration the naval appropriation bill for 1939. This bill calls for \$549,195,494—the largest peacetime appropriation in the history of our country.

Every year we hear the same old cry that the Navy needs more and more money to give the United States adequate national defense. I am a firm believer in adequate national defense and will go just as far as any Member of this House to see that we get it. I am not a pacifist, because a pacifist believes that war under any circumstances is unthinkable. My belief is that we should be ready to repel any invasion of our country or any of its territorial possessions. The homes of our citizens must be protected. There is a great difference between a war of defense and a war of offense. There is an equally great difference between the development of a Navy for defense and for offense. I do not believe that we should discard the good-neighbor policy. The day we take the leadership in the world-wide armament race, the "good neighbor" buys a gun. If, as the naval experts have repeatedly testified in support of a bigger and better Navy, we need more naval armament for purely defense purposes, then we should secure those additional defenses and do so at once. However, if we are building a Navy to send our sailors and marines all over the face of the globe to protect American dollars with American bullets, then we should not build a bigger Navy. The overseas investments of a few of our people have been made with one purpose in view—to make profits. They have been made because conditions in those countries, in the minds of the investors, make possible the securing of greater profits there than could be secured at home. The investors, with full knowledge of the fact, have placed their money outside the protection of our own laws and outside the legal jurisdiction of our own Government. There is nothing to criticize in that practice as long as the investors realize that their money is outside the jurisdiction and protection of our Government. It is the usual business theory that "the greater the profit the greater the risk of the investor." When investors in foreign countries demand the armed protection of our Government for their investments they reverse the accepted business theory and it becomes "the greater the profits the greater the risk to those who have no share in the profits." Taxation for national defense is one thing, but taxation for the defense of investments and profits of a few of our people is class discrimination of the rankest kind.

Year after year we have appropriated money for national defense, yet we have never defined what we mean by that term. The 1932 Democratic platform contained these words:

National defense. A Navy and an Army adequate for national defense based on a survey of all facts affecting the existing establishments, that the people in time of peace may not be burdened by an expenditure fast approaching \$1,000,000,000 annually.

That plank in the 1932 platform has apparently been overlooked. We will never know what our adequate national defense goal is until the question is fully discussed by the Congress. We will never have a definite goal toward which we can work until our defense policy is definitely established.

The appropriation of \$549,195,494 for the Navy as provided in this bill will not give us adequate national defense. The appropriation of another \$200,000,000 in a later bill will not give us adequate national defense. The appropriation of still further hundreds of millions for our merchant marine will not give us adequate national defense, nor will the continued diversion of relief and recovery appropriations for the Navy give us adequate national defense. No matter how much we appropriate, we cannot reach a goal that is continually moved ahead by our naval experts and which will continually be moved ahead until some definite policy of defense is established.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUCKEY of Nebraska. Yes.

Mr. SHORT. I dislike to interrupt the remarks of my friend from Nebraska, because he is making an interesting address, and I have a great deal of sympathy with the views that he is expressing. I believe all Members of Congress as well as the entire American people deplore the necessity for continuously increased appropriations for national defense, but in view of the fact that all of the other nations of the world, the leading powers, are arming to the teeth with greater armaments and spending more money than they did at the outbreak of the World War, does not the gentleman believe it is the policy of wisdom on our part to maintain a Navy adequate to meet any foe?

Mr. LUCKEY of Nebraska. I am going to touch on some phases of that, but I am now appealing from the standpoint of economy.

Mr. SHORT. Still trust in God but keep your powder dry.

Mr. LUCKEY of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, each year when the naval experts tell us we need to appropriate more money for the Navy we face a difficult decision. We want to protect our country, but we do not want to waste the resources of our people. I am quite frank to confess that it is difficult to secure expert testimony on the question from all points of view. The experts furnished us are those from the Navy Department. They all tell the same story, and there is plenty of reason why they should. Any expert in our Navy who fails to tell the same story or who ventures to criticize existing conditions is removed from the ranks of the experts by the Department's relieving him of his command. Look over the record and see if you can find any of those experts who criticized the waste and useless expenditures of the Navy still on the rolls as experts.

Since 1920 we have spent \$10,332,700,000 for national defense. Most of that expenditure has been on our Navy. Our Army has dropped from its rank of seventh in the world to seventeenth. Our Navy, while practically equal in tonnage to that of Great Britain, is, according to our departmental experts, largely obsolete and nowhere in comparison with the British Navy. You cannot blame the present condition of our Navy upon the fact that it is the highest paid in the world or upon the fact that clothing and subsistence for it is more expensive than for any other navy of the world. While those higher costs are true, they represent only a small part of the annual appropriations.

Ten years ago Rear Admiral Magruder commented that this country "was spending \$300,000,000 a year on its Navy and getting \$200,000,000 worth of navy for it." Rear Admiral Magruder was relieved of his command, but the conditions that existed in 1927 continue to exist today. In this bill we will appropriate \$549,000,000, and we will get perhaps \$400,000,000 worth of navy out of it. The same thing will apply to later appropriations. Let us see just what has happened to the money we have appropriated in the past.

On October 25, 1933, we had a splendid example of the efficiency of our war vessels. On that date a British freighter, the *Silverpalm*, collided with the armored cruiser *Omaha*. The *Omaha* was not an old boat, but a practically new one. The *Omaha* was standing still when the *Silverpalm*, traveling at a rate of 10 miles per hour, rammed into the *Omaha* about midship. The *Silverpalm* buried her nose right into the *Omaha*, making a hole 40 feet wide. The armor plate, bulkheads, and other protective devices failed

to keep the freighter from doing that amount of damage. That one illustration shows the efficiency of our Navy Department in providing protective armor plating. There were 10 light cruisers built around 1924 of the *Richmond* class. The experts tell us that those light cruisers are built so low to the water that two broadside 6-inch guns and two 6-inch guns in the after gun house cannot be fired in a rough sea.

About 1933 we built nine light cruisers—the *Omaha*, *Milwaukee*, *Richmond*, *Trenton*, *Raleigh*, *Concord*, *Memphis*, *Cincinnati*, and *Marblehead*—without bothering to test their construction design. The ships were completed, only to find that sufficient space had not been allowed to house the crew. A superstructure had to be built. I have already commented upon the efficiency of the armor plate on those vessels. A few years ago we built eight heavy cruisers and had an opportunity to test them. Despite that fact, the *Quincy* was launched in 1936 and sent off for a shake-down cruise. Every port welcomed the *Quincy* for repairs. The speed trials burned out her turbines. We should be able to learn from experience, but that does not always seem to follow.

I am not going on and on pointing out ways in which our money is dissipated, but I do want to point out just one more instance. Following the enactment of the Walsh-Healey Act, the steel makers refused to provide steel armor if they had to provide it under the terms of the Walsh-Healey Act. While the differences were settled, it did cause a lot of people to wonder why the Government did not do something about making its own armor steel. Twenty-one years ago the Government spent \$25,000,000 at Charleston, W. Va., to build a plant to make armor plate. Not one single scrap of armor plate ever came out of that plant, and in 1930 the Government finally ordered its abandonment.

If we are going to continue these ever-larger appropriations for the Navy, let us establish a national-defense policy. Let us determine just what we need, and then we can see that we get a full dollar's worth of national defense for every dollar that we spend. Then we can guarantee the taxpayers that we will have a Navy big enough for our first line of defense, secure seacoast fortification, an air corps able to repel attack from the air, and an army strong enough to keep even the most powerful invader away from our homes.

In the Seventy-fourth Congress two joint resolutions were introduced to provide for the establishment of a national-defense policy. The Senate joint resolution was introduced by Senator Benson, now Governor of Minnesota, and the House joint resolution was introduced by me. In this Congress I again introduced the joint resolution on March 1, 1937; that resolution—House Joint Resolution 254—is before the Committee on Military Affairs.

In an effort to strengthen our national defense, to eliminate the duplication of useless and overlapping bureaus in the defense forces, and to put our national-defense forces upon an economical and coordinated basis, I introduced H. R. 5785, to provide for the establishment of a Department of National Defense. In this country we continue to have an anachronistic system in control of our defense forces. The War Department and the Navy Department continue their rivalry. The Air Corps is divided into three parts—Army, Navy, and Marine. Each Department maintains separate boards and bureaus whose duties are identical and whose cost is enormous. Under a single Department of National Defense the procurement would be under one head and the duplication of technical and engineering staffs would be entirely wiped out. The division in command would be a thing of the past.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. THOMASON of Texas, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee had had under consideration

the bill H. R. 8993, the Navy appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. STARNES, for the remainder of the week, on account of important business.

To Mr. MITCHELL of Illinois, indefinitely, on account of illness.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I obtained consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on this bill and in those remarks I ask unanimous consent to include a table of the number of newspapers of all kinds in the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all those who have spoken or who may hereafter speak on this bill may have 5 legislative days after its conclusion within which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 28 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow Thursday, January 20, 1938, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### COMMITTEE HEARINGS

##### COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m., Thursday, January 20, 1938. Business to be considered: Continuation of hearings on S. 69—train lengths. Mr. J. A. Farquharson, of the Railroad Trainmen, will be the first witness.

##### COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

The Committee on Rivers and Harbors will meet Thursday, January 20, 1938, at 10:30 a. m., to hold hearings on H. R. 8327, a bill to promote interstate and foreign commerce, to improve the navigability of the Lakes-to-the-Gulf waterway, and for other purposes.

##### COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold public hearings on H. R. 8532, to amend the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, and for other purposes, Thursday January 20, 1938, at 10 a. m.

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing in room 219, House Office Building, February 1, 1938, at 10 o'clock a. m., on H. R. 8344, a bill relating to the salmon fishery of Alaska.

##### COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization in room 445, House Office Building, at 10:30 a. m., on Thursday, January 20, 1938, for the public consideration of H. R. 8562 and H. R. 8569.

##### COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

There will be a meeting of Subcommittee No. 2 of the Committee on Military Affairs in room 1310, New House Office Building, at 10:30 a. m., Thursday, January 20, 1938, for the consideration of H. R. 6246, to provide for placing educational orders to familiarize private manufacturing establishments with the production of munitions of war of special or technical design, noncommercial in character.

##### COMMITTEE ON PENSIONS

The Committee on Pensions will hold a hearing at 10:30 a. m., Friday, January 21, 1938, on H. R. 6289, granting a



pension to certain soldiers, sailors, and marines for service in the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and the China Relief Expedition, and H. R. 6498, granting pensions to persons who served under contract with the War Department as acting assistant or contract surgeon between April 21, 1898, and February 2, 1901.

The Committee on Pensions will hold a hearing at 10 a. m., Friday, January 28, 1938, on H. R. 8690, granting a pension to widows and dependent children of World War veterans.

#### COMMITTEE ON ROADS

The Committee on Roads will hold public hearings on H. R. 8838, to amend the Federal Aid Highway Act, and related proposals, on Tuesday, January 25, 1938, at 10 a. m.

#### CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on Invalid Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9007) granting a pension to Harry M. Snow, and the same was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARTON: A bill (H. R. 9039) to abolish the First and Second Export-Import Banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HILL: A bill (H. R. 9040) to amend section 35 of an act entitled "An act to promote the mining of coal, phosphate, oil, oil shale, gas, and sodium on the public domain," approved February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437), as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. LANHAM (by request): A bill (H. R. 9041) to regulate commerce by making unlawful the false and deceptive marking of goods or services, to provide for the registration of trade-marks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of certain international conventions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. LARRABEE: A bill (H. R. 9042) to amend section 2 of the act to incorporate The Howard University; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. McLAUGHLIN: A bill (H. R. 9043) to amend an act to provide for the retirement of Justices of the Supreme Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTON: A bill (H. R. 9044) to repeal the Silver Purchase Act of 1934; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LAMNECK: A bill (H. R. 9045) to change the effective date of the amendment made by the act of June 23, 1937, to Veterans' Regulation 1 (a), part II, paragraph 1 (a); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TOWEY: A bill (H. R. 9046) to amend section 112 of the Revenue Act of 1936, as amended, relating to recognition of gain or loss in case of certain sales; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BULWINKLE: A bill (H. R. 9047) to impose additional duties upon the United States Public Health Service in connection with the investigation and control of the venereal diseases; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. IZAC: A bill (H. R. 9048) authorizing negotiations and providing for the construction, maintenance, and operation of an interoceanic canal over Nicaraguan territory, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CRAWFORD: A bill (H. R. 9049) to amend section 112 of the Revenue Act of 1936, as amended, relating to recognition of gain or loss in case of certain sales; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASHBROOK (by request): A bill (H. R. 9050) to amend section 3340 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. QUINN: A bill (H. R. 9057) to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, consider, and determine the claims of Westinghouse Electric & Manufacturing Co., Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SCRUGHAM: A bill (H. R. 9058) to amend section 35 of an act entitled "An act to promote the mining of coal, phosphate, oil, oil shale, gas, and sodium on the public domain," approved February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437), as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BIGELOW: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 569) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to prohibit enforced military service on foreign soil; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorials of the Legislature of the State of Georgia, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their resolution with reference to taxes on food products made of cottonseed oil and peanut oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLAND: A bill (H. R. 9051) for the relief of O. T. Travis; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CONNERY: A bill (H. R. 9052) for the relief of Suzanne Ridley; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9053) granting the Distinguished Service Cross to Raymond P. Finnegan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GASQUE: A bill (H. R. 9054) granting a pension to Isabelle Johnston; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GUYER: A bill (H. R. 9055) granting an increase of pension to Annie Trader; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. POLK: A bill (H. R. 9056) granting a pension to Carl H. Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3834. By Mr. COFFEE of Washington: Resolution of Local 38-97, International Longshoremen's Association; Chemical Worker's Union, No. 20149; Tacoma Sign Writers Local 403; Meat Cutters Local, Cascade Lodge, No. 297, of I. A. of M.; Pierce County Employees Local, No. 120; Office Workers Union Local, No. 20360; Garage Employees Union, Local 461; Gas Station Employees Union, No. 20235; Stereotypers and Electrotypers Union, No. 91, all of Tacoma, Wash., demanding that the United States Government insist on all foreign lumber coming into the United States being plainly marked with the country of its origin and that any such lumber not so marked be denied entry; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3835. By Mr. COLDEN: Resolution adopted by Teamsters Joint Council, No. 42, of Los Angeles and vicinity, and endorsed by Retail Clerks, No. 905, San Pedro, Calif., protesting against antiunion activities and asking that same be investigated; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3836. Also, resolution adopted by the Veterans' Democratic Association, Seventeenth Congressional District, Gardena, Calif., asking for correction of discriminations against disabled enlisted men of the Army and Navy in the payment of retirement benefits, and asking that they be placed on a parity with disabled officers and warrant officers who receive 75 percent of their current pay without regard to length of active service prior to such disability; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3837. By Mr. CURLEY: Petition of Private Gabriel Cohn Post 95, Jewish War Veterans of the United States, urging speedy enactment of House bill 6704, to prevent profiteering in time of war, to equalize the burden of war, provide for national defense, and promote peace; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3838. Also, petition of the Federal Commodities Surplus Corporation Local, United Federal Workers of America, urging passage of the 5-day week for Federal employees; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

3839. Also, petition of the United States Immigration and Naturalization Local 53, U. F. W. of A. endorsing House bill 8431, the Federal Workweek Act (H. R. 8428), the Federal Workers Appeals Act; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

3840. By Mr. DELANEY: Petition of the Puerto Rico Post, No. 1105, American Legion, Brooklyn, N. Y., requesting support of petition No. 3729, which urges that the rights of citizenship be conferred on natives of the Philippine Islands now residing in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3841. By Mr. DEMUTH: Resolution of the Pennsylvania State Planning Board, urging upon Congress the creation of a permanent national planning board and suggesting that the establishment of planning and conservation regions and agencies, as provided by the Norris, Mansfield, and similar bills, be deferred pending study by, and report of recommendation from, said proposed national planning board; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

3842. By Mr. PFEIFER: Petition of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, New York City, opposing any interruption of the pneumatic-tube mail service in the city of New York; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

## SENATE

THURSDAY, JANUARY 20, 1938

(Legislative day of Wednesday, January 5, 1938)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Wednesday, January 19, 1938, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bill and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 8432. An act to provide for a flowage easement on certain ceded Chippewa Indian lands bordering Lake of the Woods, Warroad River, and Rainy River, Minn., and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 530. Joint resolution authorizing the President to invite foreign countries to participate in the ceremonies to commemorate the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the national ratification of the Constitution of the United States in Philadelphia, Pa., June 17 to 21, 1938.

### CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LEWIS. I suggest the absence of a quorum, and, in order to assure the presence of one, I ask that the roll be called.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Burke	Gillette	Logan
Andrews	Byrd	Glass	Lonergan
Ashurst	Byrnes	Guffey	Lundeen
Austin	Capper	Harrison	McAdoo
Bailey	Caraway	Hatch	McCarran
Bankhead	Chavez	Hayden	McGill
Barkley	Clark	Herring	McKellar
Berry	Connally	Hill	McNary
Bilbo	Copeland	Hitchcock	Maloney
Bone	Davis	Holt	Minton
Borah	Donahay	Johnson, Calif.	Neely
Bridges	Duffy	Johnson, Colo.	Norris
Brown, Mich.	Ellender	King	O'Mahoney
Brown, N. H.	Frazier	La Follette	Overton
Bulkeley	George	Lewis	Pepper
Bulow	Gibson	Lodge	Pittman

Pope	Sheppard	Thomas, Okla.	Vandenberg
Reynolds	Shipstead	Thomas, Utah	Van Nuys
Russell	Smathers	Townsend	Walsh
Schwartz	Smith	Truman	
Schwellenbach	Steiger	Tydings	

Mr. LEWIS. I announce that the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HUGHES] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are absent because of colds.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIETERICH] and the Senators from Montana [Mr. MURRAY and Mr. WHEELER], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MILLER] is absent, attending a meeting of the project committee of the Rivers and Harbors Congress.

I ask that this announcement be entered of record for the day.

Mr. AUSTIN. I announce that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] is unavoidably detained from the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a telegram from the secretary of the Mississippi Senate embodying a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Mississippi, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JACKSON, MISS., January 20, 1938.

HON. JOHN NANCE GARNER,

Vice President of the United States,

President of the Senate, Washington, D. C.:

The following joint resolution unanimously passed both houses of the Mississippi State Legislature and was today approved by Governor Hugh L. White:

### "Senate Joint Resolution 1

"Declaring the attitude of the Legislature of the State of Mississippi on the so-called antilynch bill now pending in the Senate of these United States.

"Whereas there is now being debated in the Senate of the United States a bill generally known as the antilynching bill; and

"Whereas this bill, if enacted into law, would be an invasion of the sovereign rights of the individual States of these United States; and

"Whereas this said antilynching bill, if enacted into law, would penalize innocent parties; and

"Whereas the enactment of this bill by the Congress of the United States would be an insult to the citizenship of the entire South; and

"Whereas the relations between the races in Mississippi are more amicable at this time than at any time since the Civil War, and the passage of this said bill would greatly endanger this status; and

"Whereas this bill is a vicious attack upon the democratic form of government and upon the theory of States' rights and is contrary to the purposes of the framers of the Constitution and the founders of our Federal Government: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Legislature of the State of Mississippi views with grave concern this attempt to foist this political legislation upon the Southern States, and urges the Senate of the United States to uphold the theory of States' rights upon which our Federal Government was founded, and submits that the passage of the said bill would be a violation of the Constitution of the United States and an insult to the Southern States and the citizens thereof; that Hon. PAT HARRISON and Hon. THEO. G. BILBO, Senators from Mississippi, and the Honorable WILLIAM E. BORAH be commended for their actions in opposing the passage of said bill; and that the contents of this resolution be immediately telegraphed to the Presiding Officer of the United States Senate. Enrolled resolution being forwarded by mail."

MISSISSIPPI STATE SENATE,  
By RAIFORD WATSON, Secretary.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate telegrams in the nature of petitions from members of the Committee Pro Spanish Democracy, and the Communist Party, Eighteenth Assembly District, New York City, N. Y., praying for the enactment of the bill (H. R. 1507) to assure to persons within the jurisdiction of every State the equal protection of the laws and to punish the crime of lynching, which were ordered to lie on the table.